THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. 14 OCTOBER, 1939 No. 4

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Identity of George Wilkins ..... *George B. Dickson* 195

Montaigne's Apologie of Raymond Sebond, and King Lear, *W. B. Drayton Henderson* 209

"The Sagittary: A Note on Othello" ..... *Rodney M. Baine* 226

Stevenson and Shakspere ..... *E P. Vandiver, Jr.* 232

Timon of Athens, Act V, Scene 3 ..... *Paul H. Kocher* 239

When Elizabethans Laughed ..... *Wm. Van O'Connor* 243

"The Fourth Forger": A Supplemental Minority Report ..... *William T. Hastings* 248

Editorial Notes and Comments ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 252

Communication ..... *Cornell M. Dowlin* 256

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/shakespeare-association-bulletin_1939-10_14_4

THE IDENTITY OF GEORGE WILKINS

By GEORGE B. DICKSON

ONE of the most difficult problems which has faced Shaksperian scholarship is the question of what relationship, if any, the obscure author George Wilkins bears to the life and work of William Shakspere. Controversy has centered chiefly about the question of whether Wilkins had any part in the authorship of *Pericles,* the best portions of which are commonly ascribed to Shakspere. As time went on certain doubts and misconceptions concerning the identity of Wilkins have sprung up, and I have here undertaken to present whatever meager evidence exists concerning this somewhat shadowy figure in the hope of clearing up some of these uncertainties.

In the early years of the reign of King James I, there appeared in London a quarto pamphlet of fifteen leaves entitled, *Three Miseries of Barbary: Plague. Famine. Civill warre.*[1] The preface is signed "Geo. Wilkins." In 1607, under the date of July 31, the Stationers' Register records, "A tragedie called the Miserye of inforced Marriage,"[2] and shortly after this the first quarto edition appeared bearing on the title page, *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage. As it is now played by his Maiesties Seruants. By George Wilkins.* 1607. On June 29th of the same year *The Travels of Three English Brothers* was entered at Stationers' Hall[3] and not long afterwards appeared in print with the names of John Day, Wm. Rowley and George Wilkins, as joint authors, signed to the dedication.[4] On October 6, 1607, the Stationers' Register records, "Jests of Cocke Watt to make you merry."[5] This collection of jokes appeared in the same year as a printed pamphlet of thirty-two leaves with a "To the Reader" signed "T.D." and "G.W." and a title page which affirms that the work was "Written by T.D. and George Wilkins. 1607."[6] Thomas Dekker was apparently the "T.D."[7] In 1608 appeared the prose romance *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre* with a dedication signed "George Wilkins."[8] This is all the direct evidence we now have which, with any certainty, links the name of George Wilkins to the literature of the period.

The Wilkins family—the name being spelled Wilkyn, Wilkyns, Wylkyn, Wylkyns etc.—appears to have been in England from an early date and to have included men of rank and fortune. The name appears no less than nine times among persons named in early Chancery proceedings from 1385 to 1467, in the Public Records Office, London.[9] They seem to have been particularly prominent in Kent where in "ye first yeare of ye raigne of Queene Elizabeth" a patent to bear arms was granted to John Wilkyns of Stoke.[10] But the family was not confined to any single county. In 1563 Thomas Wilkins was an alderman of Norwich,[11] in 1616, "Walter Wilkins, Gent of City of London" was married at St. Andrews, Holburn.[12] Indeed, the records of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries show Wilkinses in almost every county of England. London in the time of Elizabeth contained a large number of them representing all classes of society and other sections of the country showed them in almost equal force if not of equal importance. References to them in the documents of the period occur with surprising frequency and we should in all probability be justified in considering them one of the most numerous and widespread families in Elizabethan England.[13]

The most famous member of the Wilkins family was John Wilkins (1614-1672), bishop of Chester, the son of Walter Wilkins, an Oxford goldsmith. John Wilkins was made warden of Wadham College, Oxford, and took a leading position in the government of the university. He became the center of a brilliant group of men who founded the Royal Society. Wilkins adhered to the parliamentary side during the civil war, but at the Restoration hastened to make his peace with the Royalists. In 1668, by the influence of George Villiers, duke of Buckingham, Wilkins was made bishop of Chester. His most notable literary work was *The Discovery of a World in the Moone,* 1638, and there seems to be little doubt that the hero of Robert Patlock's *Peter Wilkins* derived his surname from that of the bishop.

It would be interesting to discover some evidence which

would connect George Wilkins, the dramatist, with any of the persons just mentioned. But this seems impossible. Even the discovery of contemporary allusions to George Wilkins do not justify us in concluding that we are dealing with the dramatist, for the problem is complicated by another circumstance. There were other George Wilkinses living in London, and in other parts of England, at the close of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Prof. Schelling asks this question: "Are there two or three George Wilkinses?"[14] To which it may safely be replied that there were three and more who bore the name in this period. On the 19th of June, 1612, one "George Wilkins, of the parishe of Sct. Sepulchre's, London, Victualer of the age of thirtye Syxe or thereaboutes sworne and examyned" testified in the Bellott-Montjoy case.[15] On February 4, 1639, George Wilkins was buried at the age of 50 in the parish of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London.[16] In 1623 George Wilkins of Stoke, Kent, possibly a relation of John Wilkyns of Stoke mentioned above, was living with his wife, Gora, or Saro in Surrey.[17] On April 5, 1675, a George Wilkens was buried from St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden.[18]

So many George Wilkinses living in London and elsewhere in England at this period make it quite impossible to identify the dramatist. However, Prof. Wallace attempted to identify the victualler of St. Sepulchre's with the author of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage*.[19] It appears that in 1605 Bellott, who, according to Wallace, was a friend of Shakspere's, moved to St. Sepulchre's and took with his wife a chamber in the house of George Wilkins. Wallace assumes that Wilkins kept an inn, and that Day and Rowley, with whom Wilkins had collaborated, made the inn a "familiar rendezvous." Upon this groundless assumption he imagined that Shakspere came to know Wilkins through Bellott, collaborated with him in writing *Timon of Athens* and *Pericles,* and recommended *The Miseries* to the King's Men for presentation at the Globe. Significantly Wallace remarks, "I must for the present pass the critical discussion." In other words, these guesses are not to be taken seriously by the scholar and, indeed, there is no reason beyond the similarity of names to identify the

victualler and the author. The weak point in Wallace's argument has been pointed out several times and particularly by G. G. Greenwood[20] and Prof. Adams.[21] There is no further trace of this George Wilkins, as the records of the church of St. Sepulchre's were all destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666. The lists of inhabitants and the original churchwardens' accounts, which have been preserved at the Guildhall, London, unfortunately begin at 1637 and make no mention of the Wilkins family.

There is no reason to identify or connect Wilkins with any of the numerous persons bearing the same or similar name, although that he was *not* connected with them is, of course, in most cases equally incapable of proof.

There is an even more astounding example of different men having the identical name of George Wilkins. The burial book of St. Leonard's parish, Shoreditch, records under 1603, "George Wilkins, the Poet, was buried the same day. Halliwell Street." I have thought this page worth photographing because of the controversy it has occasioned. The reference to Wilkins is to be found on the twentieth line, half way down the page. The phrase "the same day" occurs constantly and is not necessarily to be construed as meaning, as Sidney Lee thought, that he was buried the same day as he died.[22] Further up the page (the tenth line)will be found a record, "Cuthbert Solbee a servant was buried the XIX day of August." Everyone else interred on the nineteenth is referred to as having been buried "the same day" until the first entry for the twentieth appears. Whether or not Wilkins died on the nineteenth or on some earlier date is impossible to tell. The large number of deaths each day was a result of the plague which raged furiously at the time, and "the poet", as Collier first suggested, may have been a victim.[23]

In 1798 Sir Henry Ellis erroneously copied this entry as "Geo. Wilkins (Poet) Aug. 9th, 1613, buried, " getting both the day and year wrong.[24] From this he naturally blundered to the conclusion, given as a footnote, that the entry

refers to the author of *The Miseries.* The error was perpetuated, footnote and all, for the benefit of the Shakespeare Society in 1844 by Thomas E. Tomlins.[25]

It is easy to see how the "XIX" might be mistaken for "nine". But there can be no doubt that the date is 1603 not 1613. Actually the photograph shows this more plainly than the original record, which is badly stained a yellowish hue, while the writing has become faded and obscure. The camera does not record the blemishes which may have caused Ellis's mistake.

Whatever relationship George Wilkins, "the Poet," bore to George Wilkins, the dramatist, he cannot be identical with him, because, whether or not the dramatist's works were published posthumously, very little of them can have been written before the nineteenth of August, 1603, when George Wilkins "the poet" was quietly resting in his grave in St. Leonard's churchyard. The evidence for this statement, which Lee omits from his account of Wilkins, is wholly internal, yet quite conclusive.

The dramatic historians before Ellis seem not to have known of the existence of "the Poet" Wilkins and, of course, knew nothing about the private life of Wilkins the dramatist. Phillips, the earliest historian of the drama, mentions neither Wilkins nor his works. Gerard Langbaine in 1691 gives this account. "George Wilkins. An Author that liv'd in the Reign of King Charles the First, who was the Writer of a single Comedy; besides that in which he joyn'd with Day and Rowley; I mean *The Travels of Three English Brothers.* The Play I am speaking of, is call'd *Miseries of Inforced Marriage,* play'd by his Majesties Servants; printed 4to Lond. 1637. This Comedy has been a great part of it reviv'd by Mrs. Behn, under the title of *The Town Fop,* or *Sir Timothy Tawdry.*"[26] The statement "An author that liv'd in the Reign of King Charles the First" is merely an assumption. Obviously Langbaine knew only the fourth quarto of *The Miseries,* 1637, and from that concluded that the author was alive at the same time. This guess was repeated by some later writers. Charles Gildon in his revi-

sion of Langbaine's book in 1698 uses almost exactly the same words, "George Wilkins. He liv'd in the Reign of King Charles the First, and writ (besides one he join'd with Day and Rowley in) a Play, call'd, *The Miseries of Inforced Marriage,* a Tragi-comedy, 4to, 1637. Mrs. Behn took her Plot and great part of the Language of the Play, to her *Town-Fop;* or, Sir Timothy Tawdry. The other Play he join'd in is called, *The Travels of Three English Brothers.*"[27] Giles Jacob in 1723 seems to be merely copying his predecessors, "Mr. George Wilkins. An Author, who, in the Reign of King Charles I, writ one Play. *The Miseries of Enforc'd Marriage;* a Tragi-Comedy, 1637. Mrs. Behn is oblig'd to this Play for great part of the Plot of her *Town-Fop,* or *Sir Timothy Tawdry.* This Author likewise join'd with Day and Rowley in the *Three English Brothers.*"[28]

In 1780 Isaac Reed edited *The Miseries* for the second edition of *Dodsley* and wrote as a preface to the text, "George Wilkins, like many other minor poets of his time, hath had no memorials concerning him transmitted to us. He wrote no play alone, except that which is here reprinted; but he joined with John Day and William Rowley, in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers, Sir Thomas, Sir Anthony, and Sir Robert Shirley,* an Historical Play, printed in 4to, 1607. He was also the Author of *Three Miseries of Barbary, Plague, Famine, Civill Warre.* 4to B[lack] L[etter]. No date."[29] Reed knew of three quartos of *The Miseries,* 1607, 1629, 1637,[30] as well as the *Three Miseries of Barbary,* whereas Langbaine, Gildon and Jacob apparently knew Wilkins only as the author of the 1637 quarto. Reed makes no remark as to whether or not Wilkins survived into the reign of Charles, and it may safely be concluded he knew no more than he printed. D. E. Baker in 1812 was the first to record the existence of the 1611 quarto of *The Miseries,*[31] but had nothing to say concerning the author except that the play was what he calls a D[omestic] C[omedy].[32] Collier in the 1825 edition of *Dodsley* gives the full title of the *Three Miseries*[33] and boasts of his use of the second quarto, 1611, which Reed did not have.[34] He seems to have doubted at this time that Wilkins was the author of *The Miseries of Inforst Mar-*

riage and the *Three Miseries of Barbary.* Six years later he noted, for the first time, the entry of *The Miseries* and *The Travels* in the Stationers' Register.[35] In 1865 Collier stated clearly his opinion of the two Wilkinses.[36] He then wrote, "The fact has not been noticed, but it is nevertheless certain, that there were two poets of the name of George Wilkins, in the latter end of the reign of Elizabeth, and in the beginning of that of James I. Which of them was the author of the admirable drama "The Miseries of enforced Marriage," 4to. 1607, it is impossible now to determine; but the natural conjecture seems to be that they were father and son. The father, as we suppose him, died in the summer of 1603, as is apparent from the ensuing entry in the burial-book of the parish of St. Leonard Shoreditch, where two of the public theatres were situated, and where so many dramatists and actors resided:—"1603. George Wilkins, the Poet, was buried the same day, 19 August. Halliwell Street."

Collier read the entry correctly. He calls his "conjecture" that the Wilkins who died in 1603 was the father "natural". It probably is but it is also quite possible that, since the second Wilkins disappeared after 1608 and the first Wilkins likely died of plague in 1603, the father survived the son and wrote *The Miseries.* When we invade the realm of "natural conjecture" an almost unlimited number of possibilities appear. Perhaps the two George Wilkinses were related, but distantly, as cousins. Perhaps they were connected only through their common relationship to the music.

In 1867 W. C. Hazlitt held the view that there were two Wilkinses, "George, the Elder, ob. 1603," who was the author of the *Three Miseries* and *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage,* and "George, the Younger," the author of the *Painful Adventures of Pericles.*[37]

He presents the same view in his 1874-76 edition of *Dodsley,*[38] but in the latter year he must have shifted his ground, for he then declared Wilkins, "the Younger," to be the

author of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage*.[39] No reason is given for this change of opinion.

P. A. Daniel in 1879 first noticed that *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage* was founded on the story of the Calverly murder which was committed in 1605 and appeared in narrative form as a tract in the same year.[40] This proved conclusively, although Daniel did not realize it, that the George Wilkins who died in 1603 could not have been identical with the author of *The Miseries* and that there must have been two poets of the same name.

F. G. Fleay, following the lead given by Daniel, pointed out the statement in Hazlitt's *Handbook* concerning the authorship of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage* as "a mistake," and declared that the author "is not the Wilkins who died in 1603.[41] Characteristically, Fleay remarks, in the same paragraph, that the events of Calverly's life, presented in *The Miseries,* all took place before October 1603, without realizing that this statement makes it quite possible for the Wilkins who died in August of that year to have been the author. Later Fleay avoided the thorny question of the two Wilkinses but insisted that the action of he play took place 1600-1604.[42]

In 1892 Hazlitt was still puzzled by this problem when he wrote, "the question is, after all, whether the elder Wilkins was not misdescribed as a poet in the parish-book, or whether his works were, as often happened, anonymous productions, to which we have lost the clue. Saving that expression in the register, one hand might easily have written all that we possess under this name. Nor is there any other case, we believe, where father and son successively gave to the world notable literary performances.[43] If we wish to contend that the Wilkins who died in 1603 was not a poet we are backed by fact that no existing work can definitely be assigned to him, but we must also contend that the parish clerk, or whoever was keeping the burial-book of St. Leonard's, was ignorant of Wilkins's profession and deliberately went out of his way to call him a poet. This is most unlikely. The book had been kept neatly in the same hand

for several years. The writer usually gives the nearest relation of the deceased, usually the father, which indicates this George Wilkins did not leave a parent of the same name alive. Occasionally he gives the occupation, but often merely the name and address with the laconic comment "was buried the same day." He may have confused the George Wilkins of Halliwell Street with the poet of the same name, who was soon to become author of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage,* if this author had already established a reputation as a versifier, an assumption for which there is no ground. It is more reasonable to suppose that the entrant knew his man and correctly described him as "the Poet", and that, as Hazlitt suggested, we have lost the clue to the identity of his works. The entry does not necessarily mean that these works were ever published, they may have perished in manuscript, and it certainly does not imply that Wilkins was a professional writer for the stage.

Hazlitt, then, had presented a quite reasonable theory which covered all the contingencies of the case with a promise of probability. In 1906 Betram Dobell wrote, "It is certain that George Wilkins, the dramatist, lived on to 1608, after which we lose all trace of him. There is no record whatever of any George Wilkins besides the author of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage.* What must have happened, I believe, is that Collier misread the entry in the burial book, substituting '1603' for the right date, '1608.' It is easy in old writing to make such a mistake. All the dramas and prose tracts by George Wilkins which we know to have been acted or published were produced between 1606 (or possibly 1605) and 1608, after which he is no more heard of. The natural inference is that he died in the latter year."[44]

Collier had a legion of peculiar things to account for in connection with his transcripts of records, but this is not one of them. An examination of the burial book shows that the "3" cannot possibly be mistaken for an "8". Furthermore, it cannot be out of place as it is attached to the previous page also marked "1603" and the entries follow in sequence as they in turn are followed by those of the next

page. Still further there is a page containing August 19, 1608, which has no record of a Wilkins. But the suggestion that Wilkins died in 1608 is a fairly good one. He was very active from 1605-1608 and surely had a hand in five works if not more between those years. Then he drops from sight as quickly as he had come into view.

This suggestion was finally adopted by Hazlitt, who had wrestled with the Wilkins problem for so many years. In the third edition of his *Shakespear,* 1908, he wrote: *"A Yorkshire Tragedy.* I think it probable that this may have proceeded, as Mr. Bertram Dobell has contended, from the pen of George Wilkins,, and may possibly have been left by him unfinished, and received a few touches from Shakespeare, who was then still residing in London. Wilkins died in the autumn of 1608."[45] Perhaps Hazlitt was simply adopting Dobell's suggestion that Collier mistook the "3" for an "8", or he may have arrived at 1608 for the most likely date of Wilkins's death on other and more reasonable grounds. It is regretful that he did not fully restate his opinion of the two George Wilkinses at this late date.

Sir Sidney Lee's article on Wilkins for the *D.N.B.* appeared in 1921-22.[46] Lee checked the entry and found Collier correct. Concerning the Wilkins of the burial book, he wrote: "No other reference to this man has been discovered, and no extant writings can be assigned to him. 'The Poet' may have been father of the dramatist and pamphleteer. He cannot be identical with him. The latter's publications all appeared at a date subsequent to the burial entry in 1603, and none of them can be regarded as posthumous works." After reading this essay Sir Edmund K. Chambers remarks "It must therefore be assumed that . . . the 'poet' was distinct from the dramatist."[47]

F. I. Carpenter has ingeniously suggested that the two sonnets "To the Author" prefixed to Spenser's *Amoretti* in 1595 and signed "G. W. Senior" and "G.W.I." may have been written by George Wilkins, Senior, and George Wilkins, Junior.[48] This attempt to connect Wilkins and Spenser is interesting but, of course, too conjectural to carry much

weight. Carpenter has neatly eliminated other possible "G.W.'s" but has failed to apply the elimination process to Wilkins. The lives of the obscure "poet" of Shoreditch and the author of *Jests to Make you Merrie* were far removed from that of the dazzling poet-courtier of *The Faerie Queene*. But the most difficult point is to show that "I" stands for "Junior". More likely "I" simply stands for "I" and "J" is certainly a singular abbreviation to substitute for the common "Jr" or "Ir". Finally, there is absolutely no proof that "the poet" was in any way related to the dramatist, but good reason to believe he was not.

There seems to be some reason for supposing Wilkins to have lived in Shoreditch. Hazlitt came to that conclusion in his *Shakespear* where he wrote," "George Wilkins, author of many dramatic and other writings of merit and interest, resided and died in Shoreditch."[49] It was there, at the Curtain, that the play in which he collaborated with Day and Rowley, *The Travels of Three English Brothers,* was acted.[50] We know that many actors and playwrights made their homes in that locality.[51] Part of the ground known as the "Curten" in Halliwell Street was owned by a Thomas Wilkins about 1580.[52] This land became the site of the Curtain theatre. Furthermore, the dedication of *The Painful Adventures of Pericles* to Henry Fermor, one of the Middlesex justices, indicates not merely an acquaintance with that worthy but of his neighbors in that district.[53] But a diligent search of the record books at St. Leonard's which record marriages, christenings and burials, uncovered no further reference to a Wilkins between 1558 and 1660.[54] An interesting reference to this very church appears in line 635 of *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage. "Clown.* I will cry, and euery Towne betwixt Shoreditch church and Yorke bridge, shall beare me witnesse." Just how much importance may be attached to this is difficult to decide. But we may safely say that the landmark of St. Leonard's Church, Shoreditch, was a familiar one to George Wilkins.

The case for putting the date of the death of the author of *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage* in 1608 was furthered by S. R. Golding in *Notes and Queries* for 1926.[5] Gold-

ing read the prefatory "Address to Signior Nobody" in "John Day's *Humor Out of Breath,*" "Being to turne a poore friendlesse child [the play] into the world, yet sufficiently featur'd too, had it been all of one man's getting, (woe to the iniquitie of Time the whilest) my desire is to preferre him to your service."[56] He took this to mean that Day had been assisted in writing the play by an unknown collaborator who may have died during the interval that elapsed between the writing and the printing of the play, i.e., in the earlier part of 1608 and before April 12, the date of entry in the Stationers' Register.[57] Since we know Wilkins had collaborated with Day and Rowley in *The Travels of Three English Brothers* in 1607, and since Wilkins's published writings suddenly ceased in 1608, Golding suspected that the reference might well apply to Wilkins.

Whether or not we are willing to accept 1608 as the date of Wilkins's death we are at a greater loss to suggest a date of birth. In the absence of a better clue we may maintain that the author of *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage* must have been a man of some maturity. Both the nature of the plot and structural intricacy of the play would tend to favor this opinion. But that is as far as we dare go on internal evidence.

Of his birthplace, early life and education, of course, nothing is known. But concerning his schooling we may be permitted a conjecture. His work shows him to have been a man of some classical training though probably not of the university type. His introduction of the character of Dr. Baxter, Chancellor of Oxford, in *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage,* might be thought to furnish a clue as to whether or not Wilkins had been connected with he university. But Baxter is a mere puppet and cannot conceivably be based on a real personage known to the author. There is no record of a George Wilkins at either of the universities, although the name 'Wilkins' is well represented, at Cambridge as early as 1474.[58] A Gerrard Wilkins took a B.A. degree at Oxford in 1595.[59] But there is no one whom we can possibly connect with the dramatist.

There is no reason to suppose that Wilkins was at any

time an actor or regularly tied to any of the companies. Nevertheless he has been (rashly) connected at various times with the King's, the Queen's and Henslowe's companies. Fleay stated that "He left the King's company for the Queen's in 1607."[60] And again, "Wilkins left writing for the King's men, and (1607) joined the Queen's men at the Curtain. This was probably rumored to have been caused by some quarrel with Shakespeare."[61] No satisfactory meaning can be deduced from these vague statements. We know from the title page of *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage* that the play belonged to "his Maiesties seruants." This does not mean that Wilkins was in any way connected with the company. They may simply have bought a promising play from an unattached author. We know, too, that in 1607 he joined with Day and Rowley in a play for her "Maiesties seruants" but what arrangement he made for his services is impossible to guess. Ward was responsible for the statement that Wilkins was in Henslowe's employ.[62] This idea probably grew out of the connection of Wilkins with Henslowe's hacks, Day, Rowley and Dekker, but there is no mention of Wilkins's name in the diary.

But if Wilkins was not one of Henslowe's slaves, he was probably not much above them. Possibly we catch a glimpse of his character from the dedicatory letter which prefaces his romance, *The Painful Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre,* which is addressed to Maister Henry Fermor J.P. "I see Sir, that a good coate with rich trappings gets a gay Asse entraunce in at a great Gate (and within a may stalke freely) when a ragged philosopher with more witte shall be shutte foorth of doores: notwithstanding this I know Sir, that Vertue wants no boses to vpholde her, but her owne kinne."[63] Is not Wilkins, himself, the "ragged philosopher"? another, like Dekker, of the wretched literary hacks of the time, struggling against the tide of poverty and oblivion and sinking out of sight within a few months of this cry of proest.

The College of the City of New York

[1]British Museum. 1046 d.24
[2]Arber, III, p. 357
[3]Arber, III, p. 357
[4]A. H. Bullen, *The Works of John Day*, V. p. 3
[5]Arber, III, p. 360
[6]A. B. Grosart, *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* II. p. 269
[7]I bid V, p. XXII
[8]T. Mommsen, *Pericles Prince of Tyre* p. 4
[9]Harleian Society Publication, LXXIX p. 29f
[10]I bid LXXV p. 47
[11]I bid XXXII p. 204
[12]I bid, Register II, p. 46
[13]The writer has collected references to upwards of two hundred individuals bearing the name 'Wilkins' in the England of the time.
[14]*Elizabethan Playwrights* p. 223 n.
[15]C. W. Wallace, *Nebraska University Studies*, X, p. 289
[16]A. W. C. Hallen, *Registers of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate*, II, p. 51.
[17]Harleian Society Publication XLIII, p. 195
[18]Ibid Register XXXIII. Vol. IV, p. 69
[19]C. W. Wallace, *Harper's Magazine*, CXX, pp 489-510.
[20]*National Review*, Vol 55, p. 303 f.
[21]*Life of William Shakespeare*, p. 400.
[22]D.N.B. XXI p. 261
[23]*Rarest Books*, I, p. 202.
[24]*History of Shoreditch* p. 212
[25]*Shakespeare Society Papers*, I p. 34
[26]*An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* p. 512.
[27]*Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets*, p. 148.
[28]*The Poetical Register*, II, p. 272.
[29]*Old Plays* V, p. 3, 1780.
[30]Ibid p. 114.
[31]*Biographia Dramatica* III p. 46.
[32]Ibid I part II, p. 748.
[33]*Old Plays* V p. 3, 1825.
[34]Ibid V. p. 98.
[35]*History of English Dramatic Poetry* I, p. 435, 1831.
[36]*Rarest Books* I, p. 201 f.
[37]*Handbook* p. 656.
[38]*Old Plays* IX, p. 467.
[39]*Collections and Notes* p. 456.
[40]*The Athenaeum*, London, 1879, p. 432.
[41]*William Shakespeare*, p. 302, 1886.
[42]*Chronicle*, II, p. 275.
[43]*Manual*, p. 158.
[44]*Notes and Queries*, Series 10, Vol. VI, p. 148.
[45]*Shakespear*, p. 387.
[46]D.N.B., XXI, p. 261.
[47]*Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 513.
[48]*Modern Philology*, XXII, p. 67 f.
[49]*Shakespear*, p. 110.
[50]Arber, III, p. 357.
[51]*New Shakespeare Society Papers*, I, p. 31 f.
[52]London County Council. *Shoreditch* p. 18.
[53]T. Mommsen, Op. Cit. p. 3.
[54]Search conducted by Mrs. J. R. Gilbert of 17 Greystoke Lodge, Hanger Lane, Ealing, London.
[55]*Notes and Queries*, CL, p. 437.
[56]A. H. Bullen, Op. Cit., V, p. 3.
[57]Arber, III, p. 165 b.
[58]J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 410.
[59]J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* Vol. IV, p. 1633.
[60]*William Shakespeare*, p. 302.
[61]Ibid, p. 58.
[62]*A History of English Dramatic Literature*, II, p. 607.
[63]T. Mommsen, *Pericles Prince of Tyre*, p. 3.

MONTAIGNE'S *APOLOGIE OF RAYMOND SEBOND,* AND *KING LEAR*

By W. B. Drayton Henderson

FOR many years critics who believe that in the later plays Shakspere could hardly be Shakspere without Montaigne, have been showing parallels between the tragedies and romances and Florio's translation of the *Essaies* which was published in 1604 and probably known to favoured persons before that date. Naturally, Montaigne's most famous essay, the *Apologie of Raymond Sebond,* and Shakspere's greatest play, *King Lear,* have come in for special study, and a relationship has been shown to exist between them. Robertson,[1] finding strong proof that the *Apologie* affects *Measure for Measure,* suggests that much of its argument, typified in the sentence, "What greater vanity can there be than to go about by our proportions and conjectures to guess at God?", may have affected *King Lear.* Miss Hooker[2] shows a long parallel to Act III iv 107—in the passage disputing the opinion "that man is the onely forsaken and outcast creature, naked on the bare earth," etc. Taylor,[3] in addition to this, shows precedent in the essay for the "unfee'd lawyer" of the play (I iv 142—) ; for the latter part of the Dover cliff passage (IV vi 23—) ; and for "When the mind's free, The body's delicate," etc., of III iv 6—. Also he shows a remarkable connection between the essay *Of the Affection of Fathers to their Children* and Edmund's speeches, as well as other striking but smaller resemblances between other essays and the play. Perhaps, in addition to these critics, one may also name T. S. Eliot.[4] As long ago as 1919, and surely not while he was thinking about the *Dream* or the *Tempest,* he wrote: "We need to know a great many facts in Shakspere's biography: and we should like to know whether, and when, and at the same time as what personal experience he read the Apologie . . ."[5]

This present essay will attempt to go as far as possible in the direction its predecessors pointed out. And particularly it will try to satisfy at least part of the desire Mr. Eliot

expressed, by showing inducements to believe that Shakspere read the *Apologie* carefully, or re-read it, some time before he wrote, or while he was writing, *King Lear;* and that he used it as a rich mine from which he extracted, or from which he enriched, most of the "discreet judgments" in which the play now abounds. I use that last phrase from the Elizabethan critic Puttenham, whose *Arte of English Poesie* Shakspere knew well: "Poesie . . . is a metric-all speech corrected and reformed by discreet judgements." Montaigne was full of such judgements: plundered from antiquity, or promoted by his ow nexperience. Not all of them are "discreet" in the modern sense: but even those least so from one point of view, might deserve the description from another. They possess the discreetness of freedom. And, fortunately for a dramatist searching among them, they can say "aye" and "no" too, which, though it be bad divinity, as King Lear suggests, makes good conflict.

The old play of *King Leir and His Three Daughters,* the chief source of *King Lear,* needed to be "corrected and reformed." Sufficient in action, it was poor in the thought element. Not wholly lacking in language, for it gave a score of suggestions to its successors; and not wholly wanting in dramatic power, for some of its scenes easily, and some after rare change and rearrangement have come into absolute greatness, its general level is that of a plain Morality. Leir has moments of Lear-like flame ("Peace, bastard impe!) ; but on the whole he is a simple old man who rules over a country about which little more can be said. He casts off his favourite daughter and suffers in mind and body because of it, and because of his two evil daughters. The good daughter is a model of Christian charity, and forgives her father, with whom God unites her finally when all the enemies are chased away, so as to show that He regards the ways of men and watches over those that serve Him. When all is over it is hard to say what benefit either Leir or Cordella have received from their sufferings, beyond a better knowledge of each other and of Gonorill and Ragan.

Shakspere transformed that old man into a Renaissance

God-King: his Albion becomes a province or a digest of Saint Paul's "whole creation (that) groaneth and travaileth in pain together"; though he is violent and commits folly, he possesses great intelligence and executive ability; the sufferings he undergoes register in a mind whose scope grows as wide as human society; ultimately he is purged by such pains and benefits as Christianity, and the Christian humanists, had prescribed for the salvation of such a soul; Cordelia becomes in the strictest sense an instrument of redemption; the conclusion, quite contrary to the old play, cuts away all temporal happiness and every material prop to faith in a spiritual order, leaving with some minds a sense of utter disaster, and with others only a secret sense of some final value which has been attained, intangible and incommunicable. For almost all of these changes Montaigne offered suggestions, which Shakspere took in his own way. This way was a combination of humility and authority, for he listened intently to both the yes and the no of the argument, accepted one or the other or both as the purposes of drama might be served best, and stopping easily and often, converted even trifles[6] into objects of value. The main argument did not need to be distorted for this purpose. It was already set upon the correction of the Renaissance man in his pride of intellect and possessions, and more particularly of the Renaissance God-King.

Shakspere and Montaigne approach this Absolutist problem of their age from different points of view. In the *Apologie,* Montaigne is iconoclastic: perhaps because there were no God-King idols in France, as there were in countries where the King had been set up against both feudalism and the Papacy; perhaps because the Civil Wars hid from him any possibility of union between the pride of life, and Equanimity which he loved. Shakspere believes in kingliness: perhaps because he was an Englishman, and shared his countrymen's attitude towards the Tudors, perhaps because he was a dramatic poet loving power. He had grown up when the Renaissance and the Reformation were running parallel in England, and shared in the hope that they might come to a single climax. The Machiavellian lion might some day lie down with the Castiglionean lamb: or

there might be, what Sidney had imagined, a Basilious king who would unite "those virtues which get admiration, as depth of wisdom, height of courage, and largeness of magnificence" with "those that stir affection, as truth of word, meekness, couresy, mercifulness, and liberality." A little later Bacon can say with sound worldly wisdom that it is only poetry which can make such junctures, and "at pleasure join that which nature hath severed and sever that which nature hath joined." But as Shakspere was a poet, and perhaps one of the poets who caused Bacon to reflect as he did, this comment does not deter us from seeing, but aids us to see, that such a synthesis of values as is here suggested is the goal of experience in the tragedies. Hamlet before the end unites enough practise to his theory, and experience of "foul" to his adoration of "fair" to "crack a noble heart": Othello joins lover to soldier, and dies as much from the double vision of the splendour of the world as by his sword: Lear, putting off some real folly, and assimilating the wisdom of the Fool and the love of Cordelia, becomes Sidney's ideal king.

Concisely, then, the differences being admitted, essay and play have this relationship: Montaigne deals with those Renaissance assumptions of man's importance in the universe which culminate in the institution of the absolute type of ruler, the God-King. He rebukes these assumptions as egregious folly: strips the God-King into his shirt; desires (in his mood) to make him "bite and snarle at the ground"; ridicules all pretention of knowledge; and finds salvation for man in revealed religion alone, or seems to do so to readers like myself who take his confession of faith as honest within its limits, even though it is almost wholly separate from his normally pagan way of thinking. Shakspere deals with the same pretensions, and uses the same means to correct them, except for these differences: He makes us glory in sovereignty, and in the higher knowledge which is poetry: Lear, even stripped into his shirt and confessing abjectness is "every inch a king" to the last. Also, because he knew what Love was and what Beauty, and because the old play helped him in this same direction, and the woman-worship of the *Arcadia,* he gave us Cordelia. Nonetheless,

Cordelia dead, and Lear dead, if our business at the end be anything besides universal woe, it is, in the play as in the essay, by grace alone.

The first "discreet judgment" of the play is that of the God-King. The Renaissance had created him, and at least from the time when Charles V had been proclaimed "Mundi totius dominus, universis dominus," until the time when the Roi Soleil shone upon France, much of Europe did not need to be told what he was. It did need to be told what he ought to be: and Shakspere with his contemporaries, on the lower level of the English historical kings, had canvassed "the king-becoming virtues" and stepped up here and there to those attributes of "sovereignty, knowledge, reason," "sway, revenue, execution" which come to their zenith in King Lear. The old play had nothing of this to offer, except the phrase which occurs three times, "monarch of the world." Perhaps the help Montaigne offered to create such a concept was needless, seeing that the stage and the courts already illustrated or suggested it in so many ways. But Montaigne surely did offer help, and there is no way of disproving our notion that Shakespeare made use of it. He creates the idea of the God-King as he destroys it: "Is it possible?" he says,

> "Is it possible to imagine anything so ridiculous, as this miserable and wretched creature, which is not so much as master of himselfe, exposed and subject to "offences of all things, and yet dareth call himselfe Master and Emperour of this Universe? . . . Who hath sealed him this patent?" (139) "The meanes I use to suppresse this frenzy, and which seemeth the fittest for my purpose, is to crush, and trample this humane pride and fiercenesse under foot, to make them feele the emptinesse, vacuitie, and no worth of man: and violently to pull out of their hands, the silly weapons of their reason: to make them stoope, and bite and snarle at the ground, under the authority and reverence of Gods Majesty" (137). "So long as man shall be perswaded to have meanes of power of himselfe, so long will he denie, and never acknowledge what he oweth unto his Master . . . He must be stripped into his shirt" (188).

For all his acknowledgement of "the operation of the orbs from whom we do exist and cease to be," King Lear is such a universal 'master and emperour' when the play opens,

and long after. He is self-worshipping and dynastic: an orator, a law-giver, an administrator, a soldier: "I have sworn, I am firm" (I, i, 248); "when I do stare see how the subject quakes" . . . "ay, every inch a king" (IV, vi, 110). His divine right, *L'etat c'est moi,* evident everywhere, is blatant in his rebuke of Cordelia with the accent of Tudor fatherhood (Suffolk to Lady Jane Grey, or Capulet to Juliet) which Henry VIII had brought in, to legitimize or bastardize children at whim. If he could hold such an opinion of her, nobody subject to him could escape it: "Better thou Hadst not been born than not to have pleased me better" (I, i, 236—). Perhaps Lear also had moods, as he suggests later, in which he believed all that his courtiers told him: and thought "ay' and 'no' too" to be good divinity: and held that the thunder should peace at his bidding (IV vi 98-108), all the elements being his "servile ministers" (III, ii, 21), and that his own body was "ague-proof." It is certain, as he is a Renaissance sovereign, hat he is clothed as France's derived phrase of "many folds of favour" suggests (I, i, 221), and that other phrase which Lear himself applies to Goneril, "why, nature needs not what thou gorgeous wear'st" (II, iv, 271). Not a young Henry VIII nor Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, with velvets and silks and collars of cut diamonds, not the more matured Henry as Holbein has shown him, all pleached with gold, he must in his stage costume have shown some of those sumptuosities which the great of that day, even more than the rich of ours, used to change their condition from that of "naked and unaccomodated man," owing nothing to other men or animals or the richness of vegetable and mineral nature. Also, in a simpler way he is the lord of creation, and in accord with the current fashion of that time, the lower animals are in his train to assert it. Speaking broadly, it was the age of Mantegna's "Triumph of Caesar" and Andrea del Sarto's "Tribute of the Animals (or "Tribute of Egypt) to Caesar." Sforza visiting Florence in 1472 was conducted by a great company which included fifty war-horses with saddles of gold, and five hundred couples of hounds. Charles V entered Valladolid in 1518 with a procession headed by thirty falconers, birds on fist, and including twenty led chargers belonging

to the king. Benozzo Gozzoli's fresco of the procession of the Magi, in the Medici-Riccardi palace, includes an ape, a baboon, a hunting cheetah, hounds and the ridden horses. King James, as it were while Shakspere was composing *Kng Lear*

> (Rumour, thou doest loose thine aymes!
> This is not Jove, but one as great, King James:
> (Nichols: *Progresses,* I, 373)

received an ambassador from the Arch-duke, "that hath brought the king a dozen gallant mares, all with foal, four ambling horses and two stallions, all coursers of Pisa." The same James amused himself one day by lowering down a live lamb to his lions in their pit that he might see what he expected. The lions behaved as Montaigne would have them when he is maintaining the moral superiority of "the lower animals" to man. King Lear, to return to him specifically, should, I think, be understood in terms of this implied pattern of "The Tribute of the Animals"; otherwise we lose the full force of its inverse, "The Insult of the Animals" of which the play gives much. He possesses horses and hounds, and Abbey did well to introduce a hound into his picture of the Abdication, though the text admits none definitely until the fourth scene where the king returns from hunting, and Lady, the brach, stands in front of the open fire, absorbing it, envied by the Fool.

In his conceit, then, King Lear is as Montaigne describes his pattern, "the onely absolute creature in this world's frame," and it is at least possible that he is so because Shakspere got the pattern from the essay. This cannot be proved. But it is further suggested by two smaller correspondences. The first, in the play's arrangement, is Lear's knowledge of territory. After Goneril has praised him, he says to her (there is nothing at all like it in the old play), tracing on a map:

> Of all these bounds, even from this line to this,
> With shadowy forest and with champains rich'd,
> With plenteous rivers and wide-skirted meads,
> We make thee lady . . . (I i 65—).

Montaigne's passage runs:

> "As Plutarke saith, of the off-spring of Histories, that after the manner of Cards or Maps, the utmost limits of knowne Countries, are set downe to the full of thicke marrish grounds, shady forests, desart and uncouth places" (254).

The second suggests the whole pattern of the absolute creature, but I take it now as a part, because Shakspere enters it as such. Montaigne speaks of man's attempts to dignify himself:

> "Let us but somewhat consider, what (Astrology) saith of ourselves, and of our contexture. There is no more retrogradation, trepidation, augmentation, recoyling, and violence in the Starres and celestial bodies, than they have fained and devised in this poore seely little body of man. Verily they have thence had reason to name it Microcosmos, or little world . . . (245).

Even admitting that the disparages man's arrogance to value his being against the weight of the cosmos, whereas the next following passage from the play almost glorifies it, the connection is plain between Montaigne and Shakspere's description of King Lear on the heath: bewildered, but not mad; maintaining, or trying to maintain his pride of life—

> Contending with the fretful element;
> .....
> .....tears his white hair,
> Which the impetuous blasts, with eyeless rage,
> Catch in their fury, and make nothing of;
> Strives in his little world of man to outscorn
> The to-and-fro-conflicting wind and rain (III, i, 4—).

Given then the God-King the question is, what shall be done with him? The Humanists say, "In his own conceit he is Everything, all Knowledge, and all Strength. He must be opposed by Weakness and Foolishness and brought to Nothing." Saint Paul had taught so: "Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men: and the weakness of God is stronger than men" . . . "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty . . . yea; and the things which are not" (that is the "Nothings") "to bring to nought things that are" (I Cor. i, 25-28). Erasmus, learning this, had made it one of the bases of his *Praise of Folly*. More had shared it with him. Cal-

vin's gloss upon it is large and plain. Montaigne follows, and quotes the original freely:

> "Nor can nothing of ours, in what manner soever be either compared or referred unto divine nature, that doth not blemish or defile the same with as much imperfection . . . The weaknesse of God is stronger than men: and the foolishness of God is wiser than men (*I Cor.* i, 25) (229); "let us add nothing of our own unto it" (celestial knowledge) "but obedience and subjection: For (as it is written) *I will confound the wisdom of the wise, and destroy the understanding of the prudent* . . . Hath not God made the wisdom of this world foolishness?" (201).

It is to note also that, as if carried away by the very words, he makes a considerable play upon the word "nothing": "Let us add *nothing* of our own unto it"; . . . "to have learned *nothing*"; "he knew that he knew *nothing*"; "almost all the ancients affirmed *nothing* may be knowen, *nothing* perceived, nothing understood"; "speake I must, but so as I avouch *nothing*" (202); "the sweetest life I wis, in knowing *nothing* is" (196) "at last bring man to nothing" (193); "Man is a thing of nothing" (199); "because *nothing* is made of *nothing*: God was not able to frame the world without matter? What? Hath God delivered into our hands the keys and the strongest wards of His infinite puissance . . .?

> All things that are, with heav'n, with sea, with land,
> To th' whole summe of th' whole summe, as nothing stand" (229).

There is nothing novel, it is true, in *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* Also the old play had begun to sound this theme of nothings, for Cordella says "He loved me not and therefore gave me nothing": and Paphlagonia in the "Arcadia" suggests it, "I had left myself nothing but the name of king": all of which nothings may be something here. But even so, remembering Shakspere's impressionability, I think it likely that Montaigne's suggestion is responsible for what becomes a *leit motiv* of the play. This is first sounded by Cordelia replying to her father's demand in the first scene that she should speak her love for him, "Nothing, my lord," and in his astonished reiteration of it, "Nothing?" . . . Nothing will come of nothing." Other occasions follow: "Nothing: I have sworn: I am firm" (l. 248); Edmund says he is

reading "nothing"; Gloucester replies, "the quality of nothing hath not such need to hide itself" (ii 32-37); Kent says, "This is nothing, Fool" (iv 14); the Fool says, "Can you make no use of nothing, nuncle?"; to which Lear replies, "Why, no, boy: nothing can be made out of nothing" (l. 145) and finally, after the "tempestuous blasts" have "made nothing" of his words and his gestures and his torn hair, Lear himself is brought to say "No, I will be the pattern of patience; I will say nothing" (III, i, 37—). True, the old Leir become "the myrrour of mild patience . . . and never gives reply"; so perhaps all that Montaigne did here was to point the donnee. And yet, as the number of suggestions he probably gave increase in number, what pointing it was! Even the final phrase, "the pattern of all patience," so familiar to us now, may have been set going by Florio's translation. It appears in another essay, *Of Physiognamy,* in a context describing the endurance of the poor. How simply they name their diseases, compared with the rich, and endure them. From such "doth nature dayly draw and affoord us effects of constancy and *patterns of patience.*" To this condition, then, if we may use Montaigne as a gloss, the terrying God-King of the first act has been brought: He will be as patient as the very poor; more than that, he will be the idea or pattern of all patience. The rest follows naturally (though Montaigne's Pyrrhonism may yet whisper doubt about it in some ears) that the ultimate "judgement" of the play concerns the salvation of the soul. Leir loses a kingdom and regains it. Lear loses everything, and gains "nothing." But the "nothing" which he gains is greater than "Th' whole summe of th' whole summe" of things.

Many subordinate "judgements" are used to bring about this result, and since there is probably not one of them but was the common property of Renaissance thinkers, nobody will wish to credit Montaigne with having suggested all of them to Shakspere. And yet, Shakspere was a busy man. When he found a great theme, and elsewhere a great and pertinent commentary upon such a theme, I fancy that he did not waste time seeking birds in the bush. The *Book*

of the Courtier was such a commentary upon the theme of a developing prince Hamlet, and I believe that he fused the saga story and Castiglione. The *Apologie* fitted the Lear story as perfectly. In it Montaigne had concentrated the wisdom of the classical and Renaissance world. So he followed it, and we do; and not blindly.

As the God-King holds himself to be the lord of creation and claims the tribute of men, of the so-called lower animals, and of the forces of nature, to save his soul from the illusion in which it lives his authority must be completely denied in some important business. Then he must lose all his privileges. He must be made to "abjure all roofs" (as Shakspere says) : and be "stripped into his shirt" (as Montaigne put it) : and the unfended forces of nature, offensive animals and what the play calls "The winds and persecutions of the sky" must tell him what he really is. The king must suffer like the poorest of his subjects. Montaigne's early contemporary, Lodovicus Vives, in his famous letter to Leo X, had put it perfectly:

> "I wish all princes could pass some part of their lives in a private station, that they might know the wants of their subjects, and from suffering themselves, learn to pity those who suffer. But, educated amid regal pomp, they have little feeling for the calamities of others."[7]

And it is his phrase, rather than Montaigne's, that seems to be caught up in Lear's reflection upon his own experience during the night of storm on the heath:

> . . . Take physic pomp:
> Expose thyself to feel that wretches feel,
> That thou mayst shake the superflux to them,
> And show the heavens more just (III, iv, 31—).

Montaigne has nothing in the *Apologie* that leads directly to this, apart from a phrase about our "superflous and artificiall" desires, and (by inference) the superfluity of our kitchens (165). But, having been put to nurse with a peasant woman when he was a baby, and so acquired the doctrine by direct experience, which seems to have been some part of his good father's plan, he confirms what Vives said, and leads it on to the next point where suffering together with

the poor leads to an exchange of values from the bottom up. Compare the wild imaginations of the privileged, he says, with the life of "a day-labouring swaine . . . who measureth all things onely by the present sense . . . who feeleth no disease but when he hath it" (190).

> "How much more docile and tractable are simple and uncurious mindes found both towards the laws of religion and Politike decrees . . . man bare and naked, acknowledging his naturall weaknesse . . . disfurnished of all humane knowledge, and so much the more fitte to harbour divine understanding" (208).

Allow that the phrases about charity may have been suggested by Vives: It is passages like this last which (as I think) chiefly helped Shakspere to develop his donnees. In both of these, man came near being bare and naked, but he was not quite stripped, and he did not either try to maintain the power of his microcosmos against nature, nor later "acknowledge his naturall weaknesse" in words to move the world. In the old play, Leir and his Kent-and-Fool combined, Perillus, are saved from murder in a wood by a burst of stage thunder and lightning—these effects being outside the text, though the word "crack" which Shakspere took over (III, ii, 8) is used in another connection close by. Later they are robbed of their cloaks, and Perillus offers his doublet to buy back his master's garment. "Come, let us goe, and see what God will send; when all means fail, he is the surest friend," is Leir's comment. The King of Paphlagonia, in the other story, is found with his son, "both poorly arrayed, extreamely weather beaten," in the midst of "so extreame and foule a storm, that never any winter . . . brought foorth a fowler child." The king accounts for his condition, and might be with Sidney in Penshurst long gallery for all the effect the storm has upon his style. But, come to Lear, we are in another sphere. The natural storm we have seen arising from the two separate literary quarters now becomes also a storm of the mind. Thwarted by love and malice; compelled to abjure all roofs and persecuted by the winds and sky, the king is a focal point of it: "man bare and naked," or soon to be almost naked; "disfurnished of all humane knowledge" . . . "acknowledging his naturall weakness" in words suggesting "divine understanding"—

> ". . . here I stand, your slave;
> A poor, infirm, weak, and despis'd old man (III, ii, 19—).

But we must go farther even than this. For a second "judgement" demands that the God-King or over-weening man shall be shown his own true nature. Convinced that he is, as Hamlet says, "the paragon of animals," he must see himself, loveless and predatory, as "worse than brutish" (to use Gloucester's phrase, I, ii, 82): a creature impelled by cruelty, yet the most defenceless, the most vulnerable. Also he must suffer the actual physical insult of the animals. So Montaigne counsels. "We are excelled in comelinesse," he says, "by many living creatures" (180): and "we perceive by the greater part of their works what excellency beasts have over us" (146). Even omitting what "Democritus judged and proved, which is, that beasts have instructed us in most of our arts" (157), we have much to learn from them. "Can there be a more formall, and better ordered policie . . . than that of Bees?" The swallows also (it might almost be those temple-haunting martlets which build on every vantage point of Macbeth's castle)

> "chuse from out a thousand places, that which is fittingest for them, to build their nests and lodging" . . . houses of "such prety contexture and admirable framing." (145)

It would have been well if Lear had learned from them how to build against the weather—though neither essay nor play says so. The Fool's counsel comes from another quarter:

> For you trow, nuncle,
> The hedge-sparrow fed the cuckoo so long,
> That it had it head bit off by it young. (I, iv, 285—)

And yet not so much from another quarter, as independently but from the same quarter as Montaigne. "Witnesse," he says, "the provision, we see the Ants and other silly creatures to make against the cold and barren seasons of the yeare" (148). Note man's defencelessness, and contrast it with the protection with which "Nature hath clad and mantled . . . all other creatures, some with shels, some with huskes, with rindes, with haire, with wooll" (147). It seems probable that it was such passages as these that prompted what the Fool goes on to say to Lear: "Canst

tell how the oyster makes his shell?" "No." "Nor I neither: but I can tell why a snail has a house" (III, iv, 25—). And again: "We'll set thee to school to an ant, to teach thee there's no labouring i' th' winter" (II, iv, 67—).

Next we learn from Montaigne that we are more bruitish than the beasts; and the niceness of the proud human spirit is torn open to reveal a thousand vile and sub-animal conditions in us: we receive the insult of the animals:

> "And what qualities of our corporall constitution . . . cannot fit and serve a thousand beasts? Such as most resemble men are the vilest and filthiest of all the rout: As for outward appearance and true shape of the visage, it is the Munkie or Ape: . . . as for inward and vitall parts, it is the Hog. Truely, when I consider man all naked (yea, be it in that sex, which seemeth to have and challenge the greatest share of eye-pleasing beautie) and view his defects, his naturall subjection, and manifold imperfections; I finde we have had much more reason to hide and cover our nakedness, than any creature else. We may be excused from borrowing those which nature had therein favored more than us, and under their spoiles of wooll, of haire, or feathers, and of silke to shroud us" (181).

Some of this must have been common talk. Man-the-brute is the necessary Renaissance complement to what-a-piece-of-work-is-a-man. The bestiaries or Heraldry may have suggested to Shakspere something about the beastliness which is in human nature, if he needed more information than his eyes gave him. In particular, he may have learned from the very pertinent poem on the making of man, which with others concludes Book I of the *Arcadia* not many pages in advance of chapter 10 of Book II where he found Paphlagonia. There, among many other animals contributing, the lion gives heart, the sparrow "lust to playe," the dog flattery, the fox craft, the wolf secret cruelty, the cat melancholy. "Thus man was made; thus man their lord became." Also there are the suggestions made by the allowed données, which we must in no wise forget. In the old play, the times are "monstrous, vilde"; Gonorill is a "viperous woman, shame to all thy sexe"; she and Regan (in a passage about root, stock and branch which Shakspere takes over in IV, ii, 32-36) are "inhumane beasts"; and Gonorill again a "fiend in likenesse of a humane creature." With the same heavy Renaissance accent, the bastard in the *Arcadia* is scored for his "poysonous hypocrisie, desperate fraud,

smooth malice, hidden ambition, and smiling envie," and the king speaks of himself as "so serpentine a companion as I am." But admitting all this, it must be admitted also that the *Apologie* has as much more; and it also has the gift to transform what elsewhere is mostly bad names into a "judgement." Man, Montaigne says, has no prerogative of warring, in which he takes such pride. The elephant, the boar, and the bull make preparations for battle comparable to his. The tiger and the lion hunt man as man hunts them. The cuttlefish is a fisherman (147). Add also the reference to Circe transforming men into beasts (183); to man's singular sottishness" (199); to those "mungrell and ambiguous shapes betweene a humane and a brutish nature" which the Voyagers have reported, and "nations" that "change themselves into woolves" (231), it seems that we are approaching Edgar's description of man, "hog in sloth, fox in stealth, wolf in greediness, dog in madness, lion in prey" (III, iv, 92-94), and are already close to Goneril's "wolfish visage" (I, iv, 330), "boarish fangs" (III, vii, 58), and "bemonstered feature" (IV, ii, 63). In addition to which, and at once less in the common idiom and more like Montaigne's own, there is Lear's commentary upon the same Edgar "brought near to beast," and "taught . . . to assume a semblance that very dogs disdained" (V, III, 188—):

> "Why, thou wert better in thy grave than to answer with thy uncovered body this extremity of the skies. Is man no more than this? Consider him well. Thou owest the worm no silk, the beast no hide, the sheep no wool, the cat no perfume . . . Thou art the thing itself: unaccomodated man . . ." (III, iv, 95—).

It is here that the King tears off his own clothing, and, as Montaigne would have it, is "stripped into his shirt." The same Montaigne, personally the kindest of men, centuries in advance of his time in detesting all forms of cruelty, says that he would also make him "stoope and bite and snarle at the ground" (137) as we have shown. Shakspere does not go quite so far: but surely Lear crying "sa, sa, sa, sa," and "exit running" is far enough. And before this was the insult of the dogs, which until Montaigne, more than the alienists, taught me to the contrary,[8] I used to believe actual dogs, as actual as those that "disdain'd" Edgar, though not the ones Lear used to love, as he imagines:

> . . . The little dogs and all,
> Tray, Blanch, and Sweet-heart, see, they bark at me (III, vi, 65—).

In order that proud man may learn what these "judgements" would teach him he needs the help of the fool, or of "Folly," a guide unworldly, unaccomodating, and unbiased as "Reason" is often biased by the sense perceptions (they need rather to be called sense deceptions) upon which it is based. I do not think that this idea came to Shakspere much by way of Montaigne. He had it from the beginning, and it became richer as the comedies gave way to the histories, and these to the later comedies and the tragedies. Also he did not get it from the old play or from Sidney. I think that Lear's Fool came by way of Erasmus; and by way of Will Sommers, Henry VIII's fool whom Erasmus saw, and More must have known: and by way of Armin who played the wise fool in Shakspere's company, and wrote about Will Sommers with the fondness of one who would be willing to carry on that gentle tradition, were he only given the chance. Like enough, Armin sometime put a definite question to Shakspere as to why he, the virtual creator of Feste and Touchstone, was being neglected in the new plays, *Hamlet, Othello,* and *Macbeth* (unless this last follows *Lear,* as some think). Nonetheless, it is well to remember that the fool was wholly separate from the other characters in the earlier plays. Prince Hal never lets the divine folly of Falstaff into his heart: court circles will get along without Feste or Touchstone once the reconciliations are over. But Lear's Fool is a part of him. In a sense he is the king's externalized conscience, and even when he withdraws physically from the stage he remains incorporated and made one with the master he has helped to transform. Montaigne offered help to Shakspere to form this concept. Would you then have Lear, or as he puts it, "will you have a man healthy, will you have him regular, and in constant and safe condition? Overwhelme him in the darke pit of idlenesse, and dulnesse. We must be besotted ere we can become wise, and dazzled before we can be led." Here was a seventh sort to add to Armin's "Six Sortes of Sottes," the book in which the story of Will Sommers appears. Put it succinctly, if you would save King Lear bring him not only to companion but to be the Fool.

[*To be concluded*]

[1]*The Essayes of Michael Lord of Montaigne translated by John Florio* (1603): iii vols.: Everyman's Library, 1923.

[2]J. M. Robertson, *Montaigne and Shakespeare,* 2nd. ed., 1909.

[3]Elizabeth Robbins Hooker, *The Relation of Shakespeare to Montaigne,* P.M.L.A., N.S. vol. 10, 1902, pp. 312-366.

[4]George Coffin Taylor, *Shakespeare's Debt to Montaigne.*

[5]T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays.*

[6]One must not forget the common fund of rich Elizabethan phrases from which both Shakspere and Florio could borrow independently. Nor, where there is likelihood of dependence between the two, should it be overlooked that where the dates allowed it, Shakspere may have been the lender. An illustration of this last is Florio's "seelie dew-bedabbled hare" for Montaigne's unadorned "lievre" in the essay *Of Cruelty* (Everyman's lby. ed., as always in my references, Vol. II-117). It can hardly deny a Stratford origin with "Poor Wat" in *Venus and Adonis,* "Then shalt thou see the dew-bedabbled wretch" etc. Nonetheless, it is patent that Shakspere used the Essays as a lexicon and an encyclopaedia. And among the trivia of the *Apol.* to which he stooped must have been some, no one can say how many, of the following. For completeness I note a few instances which apply to other essays, or to other plays than *K. L.* A wren (175) who, though only disporting with a crocodile, may have helped give a local habitation and more precise name to Ovid's incestuous birds (167) and so suggested Lear's adulterous creature (IV vi 115); "a tiger, the fiercest and most inhumane beast of all" (176), which glosses "tigers, not daughters" (IV ii 40); the lovely, borrowed description of the halcyon's nesting (177) which may have suggested "halcyon beaks" (II ii 282); "hurly-burly" (178, 220) cf. *Macbeth* I i 3: "A gust of contrarie winds . . . Cast but a little dust in his eyes" (170), *cf.* "You are not worth the dust which the rude wind Blows in your face" (IV ii 30-); "a singular scottishness in man" (199), "gregious scottishness . . . of mans wit" (220), "a scottish arrogancie" (237), *cf.* "Then he called me sot" (IV ii 8); the long French extract, "la lumiere commune, l'oeil du monde," etc. (217), which, with or without o.p. "swear not by heaven"; "I swear by earth, the mother of us all," may have led to "by the sacred radiance of the sun" (I i 3); "this peece of work—" (229)—the world—*cf. Hamlet* II ii 323 "what a piece of work is man"; and "he that should fardle-up a bundle" (255) *cf. H,* III i 76, "who would fardels bear," the burden in both cases being mental; "Oh sencelesse man, who cannot possibly make a worme, and yet will make Gods by dozens" (237), *cf.* "I such a fellow saw; Which made me think a man a worm" (IV i 35-38): the speaker, Gloucester, goes on to make one of the half-dozen gods, or judgements of god, later discussed in our text: "To accomodate the motions which they see in man, the divers functions and faculties" (246), *cf.* "unaccomodated man" (III iv 110); "The Stoickes" (locate the soul) "within and about the heart" (253), *cf.* "Then let them anatomize Regan; see what breeds about her heart" (111 vi 80); "and there is no beast (but man) "to which one may more justly apply a blinding bord, to keep her sight in . . . and keep from straying" (272), *cf.* the stocking of Kent (II iv 7—); "It is a mortall hand, that presents it, and a mortall hand, that receives it" (277), *cf.* "O, let me kiss that hand", "Let me wipe it first; it smells of mortality" (IV vi 135); "enteressed in the matter" (281), *cf.* "interess'd" (I i 87), Shakspere's unique use of the word; "a robe after the Persian fashion, long, damasked, and perfumed" (299), *cf.* Lear to the disguised Edgar, "I like not the fashion of your garments; you will say they are Persian attire" (III vi 81—); "play the wilie fox" (302), *cf.* "Ingrateful fox" III vi 28); "entire and perfect" (307), *cf.* Othello V ii 145, "one entire and perfect chrysolite." Other essays may also have contributed to *K.L.*: *e.g. "Of Crueltie"* (Vol. II xi) "so marble-hearted and savage-minded men" (121), *cf.* "Ingratitude, thou marble-hearted fiend" (I iv 281); *that the Taste of Goods or Evils Doth Greatly Depend on the Opinion We Have of Them* (Vol. I x), "court holy-water," (285) *cf.* "court holy-water in a dry house" (III ii 10); *Of the Canniballes* (Vol. I xxx), The cannibals eat and kill their prisoners, "not, as some imagine, to nourishe themselves . . . as anciently the Scythians were wont to do" . . . "the barbarous horror of such an action" (223), *cf.* "The barbarous Scythian" etc. (I i 118).

"THE SAGITTARY: A NOTE ON *OTHELLO*".

By RODNEY M. BAINE

SINCE the "usual" view of the "Sagittary" or "Sagittar",[1] to which Othello carried Desdemona on their wedding night, is that it is to be regarded as an imaginary Venetian inn, the importance of supporting this view may perhaps be questioned. Nevertheless, its careful consideration is necessary, for there exists nowhere a careful exposition of the supporting evidence, whereas the standard Arden *Shakespeare*[2] has an entire page attempting to rehabilitate Knight's conjecture that the Sagittary is to be identified with the Venetian Arsenal; and there appeared in the *Modern Language Review* for January, 1932, a twelve-page article[3] by Miss Violet M. Jeffery endeavouring to identify it with a Venetian street, the *Frezzaria.* This article is the more important because the author uses her conjecture in an attempt to prove that Shakspere visited Venice and because her identification has been accepted as conclusive by the editor of the popular 'New Temple' *Shakespeare.*[4]

The passages directly concerned are the following: After Iago has raised Brabantio to search for his daughter, he leaves Roderigo with the direction:

> " . . . That you shall surely find him, Lead to the Sagittary the raised search; And there will I be with him."[5]

When, in the next scene, Cassio discovers Othello and Iago talking, he informs the Moor:

> " . . . You have been hotly call'd for;
> When, being not at your lodging to be found,
> The senate hath sent about three several quests
> To search you out.
> *Oth.* 'Tis well I am found by you.
> I will but spend a word here in the house,
> And go with you.
> *Cas.* Ancient, what makes he here?"[6]

Finally, when Othello is accused by Brabantio of using hellish practices to win his daughter, he asks that she herself be summoned to clear him:

> "*Oth.* Send for the lady to the Sagittary . . .
> *Duke.* Fetch Desdemona hither.
> *Oth.* Ancient, conduct them; you best know the place."[7]

No evidence of the contemporary view of the Sagittary exists; but it is significant that the early editors of Shakspere considered annotation unnecessary and that Steevens, the first to gloss it, was concerned only with describing the sign.[8] From as early as 1693 there exists proof that it was regarded as an inn, for in his *Short View of Tragedy,* Thomas Rymer acidly remarked, "This Senator's Daughter runs away to (a Carriers Inn) the *Sagittary,* with a Black-amoor";[9] and in 1733 Theobald gave as his scene direction for Act I, scene ii: *"SCENE changes to another STREET, before the SAGITTARY."*[10]

Ambiguity arose only wheh Charles Knight attempted to identify it with "the residence at the arsenal of the commanding officers of the navy and army of the republic". "The figure of an archer," he claimed, "with his drawn bow, over the gates, still indicates the place. Probably Shakespeare had looked upon that sculpture."[11] It would seem that Knight assumed that Othello must have taken Desdemona to his lodgings, which, he hazarded, would be at the largest military residential section in Venice, hence, at the Arsenal. The statue of an archer was all he could discover to support his conjecture, which was of course worthless in absence of definite proof that the Arsenal or some part thereof was known in Shakspere's day as "the Sagittary". Singer[12] soon drew attention to the lines [13] which invalidate Knight's original assumption; and later Rolfe enlarged upon Singer's objection and in an especial appendix challenged: "We cannot find any evidence that the Arsenal at Venice was ever called 'the Sagittary'".[14] Hart, however, ignoring Rolfe's actual disproof, confused the issue with a pointless etymological demonstration.[15] Finally, Miss Jeffery ably destroyed the only excuse for the hypothesis by proving that the figure of Mars as archer, upon which it ostensibly rested, had not even existed in Shakspere's time.[16]

For Knight's disproved conjecture, however, Miss Jeffery substituted another based upon evidence almost as flimsy. She argues: "In Act I, scene i, 159, Iago bids Roderigo:

> 'Lead to the Sagittary the raised search,
> And there will I be with him.'

The implication is undeniable that the scene, in which Roderigo leading the search party comes upon Iago and Othello, will be set in the 'Sagittary' itself.

"That scene takes place in the street outside the house to which Othello has taken Desdemona: for Othello, on receiving the urgent summons from the Senate, replies (Act I, sc. ii, 48):

> 'I will but spend a word here in the house,
> And go with you.'

"The 'Sagittary', then, is a street in Venice . . ."[17] But Iago's direction:

> " . . . That you shall surely find him
> Lead to the Sagittary the raised search . . ."

does not necessarily imply that the following scene will take place *in* the Sagittary; there is no *a priori* reason why it cannot take place *at* the Sagittary. Shakspere is having Iago give a definite place direction; he would not have been so vague as to leave the impression that Brabantio was to raise an entire street.[18] Miss Jeffery has not quoted the particular line which shows conclusively that Iago is giving a careful direction, "That you shall surely find him." "Surely" here obviously means "certainly"; "to the Sagittary" and "and there" also seem definite enough. The facts that the place-word "Sagittary" was without a compounding "street" or "lane" and that this type of name was especially popular for inns[19] would have immediately suggested to an Elizabethan audience that Iago was referring to an inn.

During the next scene the audience would have had difficulty in identifying a "Sagittary" street. London street signs were rare; and when they did exist they were built into house fronts:[20] obviously such a sign would have been extremely difficult to represent on the rapidly shifting Elizabethan stage. But it would have been easy to hang out an inn sign from the balcony to indicate that the scene had shifted to the "Sagittary". Miss Jeffery may have been tempted to regard the Sagittary as a private home because

Othello speaks of "the house"; but a glance at Shakspere's inn-scenes[21] will show how commonly he used the word to designate an inn.

"When Othello," continues Miss Jeffery, "urges the Duke:

> 'Send for the lady to the Sagittary,'

and to Iago adds the command (Act I, sc. iii, 121):

> 'Ancient, conduct them:
> You best know the place.'

he is bidding Iago conduct them to the particular house in the 'Sagittary' where Desdemona is to be found. They would all know the street, but Iago's mission is to lead them to the precise house which he alone knows."[22]

But Miss Jeffery is building an imaginary house; none is mentioned in the text. There is only one place named, the Sagittary; and since "the place", as Miss Jeffery implies, cannot refer to a street, it must refer to an inn. It would have been impossible for Shakspere to have been more definite.

Miss Jeffery then goes on to identify the Sagittary with a particular Venetian street, the *Frezzaria;* and since I strongly suspect that it was her acquaintance with this street that first suggested her hypothesis, it seems necessary to show that Shakspere did not take the name for his inn from the *Frezzaria.*

"The 'Sagittary'," writes Miss Jeffery, "is one of the most characteristic *calli* of Venice. It is none other than the *Frezzaria*, a narrow dark street, which runs from the Sallizada San Moise just off Piazza San Marco, takes a right-angle turn, and ends on the Ponte dei Barcoroli near Campo San Fantino. The *Frezzaria* was so called because the makers of arrows had their shops there . . . It must be clearly understood that the 'Sagittary' of *Othello* is in no way connected with the zodiacal constellation Sagittarius: nor with the Centaur, the Sagittary referred to in *Troilus and Cressida.* It is not the same word at all, but an entirely

new word, coined by Shakespeare; concocted, moreover, with a singular penetration into the formation of Venetian street names. *Sagittary* was formed by analogy with *Frezzaria.* The two words are identical in construction and meaning. In Shakespeare's time the word arrow could be expressed in two ways in Italian. One is *frezza* (the Venetian counterpart of the Italian *freccia*) ; the other is *sagitta* (the literary form of *saetta*). Add the suffix *aria* to the first, and *Frezzaria* results. Add the suffix *ary* to the second and *Sagittary* results. It is hardly necessary to point out that the suffix *ary* is the English equivalent of the Italian *aria* . . . The resultant form—*Sagittary*—is a perfect counterpart in construction and meaning of *Frezzaria.*"[23]

Now, it cannot be denied that Shakspere coined a great many words; but this particular one had long been part and parcel of the English language and possessed primarily the meanings Miss Jeffery has already mentioned. Her *a priori* dictum that "It must be clearly understood" that Shakspere was not employing one of these cannot be accepted when the *N.E.D.* gives no example of the use of "Sagittary" to mean "archer" until the middle of the nineteenth century. Shakspere was not coining a word; he had used the very same one only about a year before in *Troilus and Cressida,*[24] where, as Miss Jeffery states, it denotes the centaur. It is certainly more than a coincidence that in *The Comedy of Errors*[25] he had actually used the Centaur as the sign of an imaginary Ephesian inn. As there was a court revival of this play on 28 December, 1604, the very year in which *Othello* was written and less than two months after its performance at court, it is not impossible that in his use of the word "Sagittary", he was merely giving a new name to a familiar stage property.

On the other hand, to bolster her conjecture, Miss Jeffery is eager to support the implications that in order to coin "Sagittary" from *Frezzaria* Shakspere must not only have known both literary Italian and the Venetian dialect but that he must have visited Venice. But her evidence for the former is nowhere forthcoming; and half her evidence for the latter consists in his use of the word under discussion. Miss Jeffery

has avoided another issue. The actual reading of Q_1, supported in one instance by Q_2, is not "Sagittary", but "Sagittar", a form in Shakspere's day both rare and obsolescent.[26] Now, a copyist's or printer's change from the unfamiliar to the popular form is probable; and since the Folio form had appeared in *Troilus and Cressida,* it is possible that Shakspere used both forms in the same play. But had he coined a word strictly on the analogy of *Frezzaria,* the textually preferable form, "Sagittar" would never have appeared.

Shakspere was not attempting, "contrary to his usual custom, . . . to paint in minute details"[27] local colour recognizable only to the philologically-minded Venetian travellers in his audience. The "Sagittar" is Shakspere's name for an imaginary Venetian inn.

Merton College
Oxford.

---

[1]To avoid raising the issue until the proper time, I shall postpone stating the reasons for my preference of the latter form.
[2]*Othello,* ed. H. C. Hart, 1917, pp. 16-17.
[3] V. M. Jeffery, "Shakespeare's Venice", *M.L.R.,* Vol. XXVII, pp. 24-35.
[4]*Othello,* ed. M. R. Ridley, 1935, p. 155.
[5]*Othello,* I, i, 158-60.
[6]*Othello,* I, ii, 44-49.
[7]*Othello* I, iii, 115-121.
[8]*Plays of Shakespeare,* ed. George Steevens, 1778, Vol. X, p. 457. No annotation appeared in 1773.
[9]T. Rymer, *A Short View of Tragedy,* 1693, pp. 94-95. Rymer probably had in mind no particular inn; the carrier's inn was merely a common contemporary type.
[10]*Works of Shakespeare,* ed. L. Theobald, Vol. VII, p. 380.
[11]*Pictorial Edition of Shakespeare,* ed. C. Knight, 1839-43, Vol. I, p. 264.
[12]*Dramatic Works of William Shakespere,* ed. S. W. Singer, 1856, Vol. X. pp. 12-13.
[13]*Othello,* I, ii, 44-49, quoted above.
[14]*Othello,* ed. W. J. Rolfe, 1891, p. 210.
[15]*Othello,* ed. W. C. Hart, *loc. cit.*
[16]V. M. Jeffery, *op. cit.,* p. 25.
[17]V. M. Jeffery, *op. cit.,* pp. 25-26.
[18]The *Frezzaria,* by the way, is a rather long one.
[19]Compare the famous Mermaid Tavern and Shakspere's own "Centaur" in *Comedy of Errors* I, ii, 9 *et passim.*
[20]Philip Norman, *London Signs and Inscriptions,* 1893, pp. 1-2 *et passim.*
[21]e.g., the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* and *I and II Henry IV, passim.*
[22]V. M. Jeffery, *op. cit.,* p. 26.
[23]V. M. Jeffery, *op. cit.,* pp. 26-27.
[24]*Troilus and Cressida,* V, v, 14-15.
[25]*Comedy of Errors,* I, ii, 9 *et passim.*
[26]According to the *N.E.D.* it was last used in its mythological significance by T. Carew in 1624.
[27]V. M. Jeffery, *op. cit.,* p. 28.

STEVENSON AND SHAKSPERE

By E. P. VANDIVER, JR.

ONE of Stevenson's best-known passages is that in which he lists the writers whose styles he carefully imitated during his apprenticeship: Hazlitt, Lamb, Wordsworth, Sir Thomas Browne, Defoe, Hawthorne, Montaigne, Baudelaire, and Obermann.[1] Since Shakspere's name is missing from this group, one might hastily assume that Stevenson was not greatly interested in him. But he was, as his frequent references to Shakspere in his essays, letters, poems, and travel-books indicate. He definitely states his love for Shakspere and the belief that he is a good reader of Shakspere's works.[2] His most interesting account of the writers that he especially enjoys reveals that he is fond of re-reading three of Scott's novels, one of Dumas, Meredith's *The Egoist,* Montaigne's essays, and the works of Moliere and Shakspere.[3] He pays a great tribute to the constant attraction that Shakspere has always had for him, though candidly admitting that he has never read—that is, in their entirety—and never will read, *Richard III, Henry VI, Titus Andronicus,* and *All's Well that Ends Well.* All of the above frank confessions are made in the delightful book *Memories and Portraits.*

Stevenson's first travel-book, *An Inland Voyage,* contains a reference to the song "Come away, Death" (in *Twelfth Night*).[4] His account of how he spoke of his recent mishaps to a group of young ladies is humorously compared to Othello's recital of his hardships to Desdemona.[5] To emphasize the ideal of aiming high even if one is obliged to be satisfied with attaining a goal not as lofty as the one originally aimed at, Stevenson remarks that Endymion is better for having visions of the moon even if he later marries Audrey.[6]

Virginibus Puerisque opens with the arresting idea that Shakspere's men are the kind that marry; that even Mercutio would have married if he had lived longer, since he was like Biron and Benedick; and that Iago also was mar-

ried.[7] Stevenson then points out that in George Sand's French version of *As You Like It* Jaques marries Celia. Falstaff is the one important exception. Farther on, Stevenson, in commenting on the fact that some people do not fall in love, refers to the difficulty Shakspere experienced when Queen Elizabeth desired him to write a play dealing with Falstaff in love.[8] Stevenson's own fondness for Falstaff—and he often refers to the old playboy—is indicated when he says that though the fat knight lacked both sobriety and honesty, the world could better bear the loss of a gloomy Barabbas than that of Falstaff (a statement reminding one of Prince Hal's utterance, when he saw Falstaff feigning death, that he could have better spared a better man).[9]

In this same book Stevenson criticizes those who give lip-service to Shakspere because it is the thing to do but who really do not enjoy him because they cannot appreciate him.[10] In praising the beauty of the relationship of a happy couple, he points out that the message of a caress is more effective and more eloquent than any written message, even if Shakspere were the writer.[11] In "An Apology for Idlers", supporting his thesis that we should not cause enmity or trouble by our unduly zealous efforts to shine in our industriousness and that, consequently, we should not consider ourselves of excessive importance to the world, he suggests that if Shakspere had died as a young man, the world would have continued to progress about as usual.[12] In "Child's Play", however, Stevenson, with the Emersonian idea of compensation, remarks that as the child grows into a man the loss of playing soldier may be partly mitigated by the acquisition of the ability to appreciate Shakspere.[13] Four quotations from four different plays occur in this book.[14]

In *Familiar Studies of Men and Books* there are interesting comparisons of Shakspere with other writers. Stevenson regards a scene of pathos in Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables* as touching as anything in Shakspere.[15] He speaks disparagingly of Thoreau's abstinence from coffee, remarking that Shakspere, after drinking a quantity of ale, could write better verses about the sunrise than could Thoreau with his coffeeless sobriety.[16] In answer to critics who

object to Whitman as a bad influence, he merely says that he thinks Whitman no more dangerous than Shakspere.[17]

Shakspere's error in giving Bohemia a seacoast does not lessen the artistic worth of *The Winter's Tale;*[18] Thoreau would have been more influential if he had possessed Falstaff's persuasive tongue;[19] the youthful Charles of Orleans was in a situation similar to that of Hamlet[20]—these are interesting thoughts. But even more interesting is the comment on Samuel Pepys' opinion of Shakspere. Stevenson admits that Pepys probably underrated him as a dramatist but asserts that Pepys held his poetry in high esteem. Pepys, he continues, not only memorized the "To be or not to be" soliloquy but also set it to music.[21]

In *The Silverado Squatters* Stevenson refers to one of the Westerners, an egotistical and brutish fellow, as Caliban four times[22] and as Caliban-Malvolio once.[33]

In *Memories and Portraits* Stevenson criticizes Shakspere for making the grave-digger in Hamlet lack a sense of feeling.[24] In "Talk and Talkers" he comments on the fact that in order to have good conversation a group must be composed of congenial persons: it would be interesting to have a conversation between Falstaff and Mercutio or between Falstaff and Sir Toby, but not between Falstaff and Cordelia.[25] There are interesting references to Malvolvio," sick with self-love";[26] to Corin and Touchstone;[27] to Rosalind and Arden;[28] to Hamlet;[29] and to Pistol.[30] In "The Character of Dogs" is an account of a dog who suddenly lost his chivalrous attitude towards women; if the dog had been Shakspere, according to Stevenson, he would have written *Troilus and Cressida* as a diatribe against the sex against whom he had turned.[31] In "Talk and Talkers" there is an interesting anecdote about an old gentleman who was very fond of reading and quoting Shakspere but who confessed that he had never been able to read all of *Othello* because the story was too painful for him.[32]

In defending his own practice of imitating the styles of

other writers, Stevenson refers to several distinguished writers including Shakspere, who, he says, were the product of a school of writers.[33] In discussing Dumas, he asserts that he does not love any of Shakspere's characters as completely as he does d'Artagnan;[34] and in "A Gossip on Romance" he states that most readers love *The Arabian Nights* more than they do Shakspere.[35] In this last essay appears the well-known praisee of Meredith's portrayal of the final scene between Lucy and Richard Feverel as something unexcelled in English literature since Shakespere.[36]

In *Across the Plains* Stevenson again turns to *Henry IV* for characters to illustrate his statements. The first negro waiter whom he encountered in America acted towards him as Prince Hal did towards Poins and Falstaff; thus Stevenson vividly suggests the independence and self-assurance of a certain ttype of negro.[37] In another place he compares the rough and bumpy face of the French Commissary to that of Bardolph.[38] In "A Chapter on Dreams" he tells a story about a young writer who is visited at night by little creatures who bring him ideas for his stories and whose work he interrupts during the night with excited comments in the same manner that Claudius interrupts the play in *Hamlet*.[39] During his long trip across the plains on an American train Stevenson was nicknamed Shakspere by his fellow travellers.[40]

One of the most interesting and amusing of Stevenson's anecdotes—in the essay "Beggars"—is that concerning a boy who lay on a hospital cot next to the bed of a friend of Stevenson. The boy ordered that a copy of Shakspere be brought to him and took great delight in reading the book, much to the amazement of Stevenson's friend, who discovered that the boy understood very little of what he read and took most delight in the passages he least understood—the utterances of the ghost. Apparently the boy was enchanted with the sound and fury of the words even if they signified nothing to him. And in this connection Stevenson says that he himself would like, if he had an opportunity, to question Shakspere as to the meaning of one or two things he has written. He also states that if he could go

back to the Elizabethan Age he would certainly visit Blackfriars to see Shakspere play the part of the ghost in *Hamlet,* thinking what a shock it would be to Burbage to learn that the center of attraction was not he but the ghost.

In discussing the state of the common people on one of the Gilbert Islands (*In the South Seas*), Stevenson, reflecting on the remark of the king that the commoners were not paid for their work since they were all brothers together, is reminded of the fact that there was formerly a brother in Arden.[42] "Some Gentlemen in Fiction", after a reference to Nym, Pistol, Caius, and Evans, contains a criticism of Hamlet.[43] Hamlet's thoughts are admirable, but Stevenson is displeased by the reference to his obesity. Hamlet is essentially a gentlemen, this aspect of him being emphasized by Salvini. The only exception to the splendid deportment of Hamlet as the ideal gentleman occurs in the scene with his mother. Here, Stevenson thinks, Shakspere failed in his delineation of Hamlet's character since his conduct in this scene is too crude. In "On Some Technical Elements of Style in Literature" are references to Rumour's Prologue to 2 *Henry IV,* Falstaff's praise of Sherris, the prose of Rosalind and Orlando, and Othello's farewell to war.[44] In "Salvini's *Macbeth*" Stevenson pays a high tribute to Salvini's interpretation of this role.[45]

Stevenson's *Letters* also contain several statements concerning Shakspere. In one place he stresses the idea that when a person is in trouble or suffering, he turns to stories, not philosophy. Instead of reading Shakspere, George Eliot, or Balzac, he turns to Charles Reade, Dumas, *The Arabian Nights,* or especially Scott.[46] *Richard II* is referred to as a fine but "ranting" production;[47] *Richard III* as a melodrama written by a man who did not then know the world.[48] With the part of Duke Orsino, in *Twelfth Night,* which role Stevenson was to play in an amateur performance, he declares that he is delighted.[49] Writing to his friend W. E. Henley (in May, 1884), he confesses that his view of life is "essentially the comic; and the romantic comic". *As You Like It* he considers the "most bird-haunted spot in letters". After this play he places *The Tempest* and

Twelfth Night. Referring to these three plays he says they signify what he means by "poetry and nature".[50]

Stevenson's poetry also contains some Shaksperian allusions. He refers to Jaques in "A Valentine's Song"[51] and concludes "The Cruel Mistress" with the thought that it is better to be Falstaff than Obermann.[52] In the short poem "After Reading *Antony and Cleopatra*" he pays a tribute to Shakspere's depiction of the charm of Cleopatra by voicing the thought that after reading the play he would prefer, like Antony, to die embraced by Cleopatra than remain alive without her love.[53]

In "Books Which Have Influenced Me" Stevenson regards Shakspere as the greatest influence on him. In addition to Kent's speech while Lear is dying, which profoundly impressed him, he pays especial tribute to the good influence exerted on him by Hamlet and Rosalind.[54]

It is thus evident that Stevenson praised Shakspere highly and, according to his own words, was influenced by him beneficially more than by any other writer. In his essays, travel books, letters, and poems he is fond of referring to Shakspere's plays and characters, either for illustration or to comment upon them. He mentions at least thirty-six different Shaksperian characters. Of these, seven—Rosalind, Orlando, Touchstone, Jaques, Celia, Corin, and Audrey—are in *As You Like It*. Six belong to the Falstaff group: Falstaff, Hal, Pistol, Poins, Nym, and Bardolph. Falstaff seems to be his favorite character for citation when a comparison is desired. Hamlet also is the subject for several short discussions. The characters of *As You Like It*, the Falstaff group, and Hamlet seem to occupy Stevenson's mind especially. That he should be interested in the first two groups is only natural, considering his love of romance and high spirits. And the fact that he was interested in Hamlet requires no explanation.

Mary Baldwin College
Staunton, Virginia

[1]*The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson*, Tusitala ed. (London: William Heinemann, 1923) XXIX, 28.

[2]XXIX, 55.
[3]XXIX, 110.
[4]XVII, 51.
[5]XVII, 57.
[6]XVII, 104.
[7]XXV, 1.
[8]XXV, 23.
[9]XXV, 37.
[10]XXV, 7.
[11]XXV, 37.
[12]XXV, 59.
[13]XXV, 106.
[14]XXV, 8, 21, 44, 58.
[15]XXVII, 13.
[16]XXVII, 82.
[17]XXVII, 79.
[18]XXVII, 17.
[19]XXVII, 105.
[20]XXVII, 153ff.
[21]XXVII, 194.
[22]XVIII, 206, 209, 226, 243.
[23]XXIII, 210.
[24]XXIX, 22.
[25]XXIX, 82.
[26]XXIX, 90.
[27]XXIX, 97.
[28]XXIX, 113.
[29]XXIX, 124.
[30]XXIX, 78.
[31]XXIX, 98.
[32]XXIX, 87-89.
[33]XXIX, 30.
[34]XXIX, 117.
[35]XXIX, 126.
[36]XXIX, 126.
[37]XVIII, 87.
[38]XVII, 116.
[39]XXX, 46.
[40]XVIII, 98.
[41]XXV, 167f.
[42]XX, 306.
[43]XXVI, 104-106.
[44]XXVIII, 39f.
[45]XXVIII, 147-152.
[46]XXXII, 104.
[47]XXXII, 187.
[48]XXXIV, 50.
[49]XXXI, 224.
[50]XXXII, 308.
[51]XXIII, 122.
[52]XXIII, 241.
[53]XXIII, 102.
[54]XXVIII, 63.

TIMON OF ATHENS, ACT V, SCENE 3

By PAUL H. KOCHER

THE almost universal opinion[1] of critics has long been that this brief ten-line scene was written not by Shakspere but by some other author, probably Middleton or Chapman. In spite of the evil days on which the parallel passage method has fallen of late, it is worth while to call attention to certain rather striking parallels between this scene and other scenes in plays admittedly Shakspere's; which warrant at least a re-examination of the whole problem.

The Timon scene reads as follows in the Globe edition[2]:

The woods. Timon's cave and a rude tomb seen. Enter a Soldier, seeking Timon.

Sold. By all description this should be the place.
Who's here? speak, ho! No answer! What is this?
Timon is dead, who hath outstretch'd his span:
Some beast rear'd this; there does not live a man.
Dead, sure; and this his grave. What's on this tomb?
I cannot read; the character I'll take with wax:
Our captain hath in every figure skill,
An aged interpreter, though young in days:
Before proud Athens he's set down by this,
Whose fall the mark of his ambition is.

To line 2 there is a suggestive parallel in the words of Imogen in *Cymbeline* as she stumbles on the cave of Belarius during her wanderings in the woods:

. . . But *what is this?*
Here is a path to't: 'tis some savage hold:
I were best not call; I dare not call: yet famine,
Ere clean it o'erthrow nature, makes it valiant.
Plenty and peace breeds cowards; hardness ever
Of hardiness is mother. *Ho! who's here?*
If any thing that's civil, *speak; if savage,*
Take or lend. *Ho! No answer?* then I'll enter. (III, 6, 17-24).

It will be observed that the italicized words together exactly comprise line two of the Timon scene and that the two situations are closely similar: a person coming upon a cave in the woods halloos to attract the attention of its inhabitant, but without success. The difference between the

passages is only that Imogen is more garrulous in her self-communing than is the Soldier. The resemblance noted seems too close to be the result of pure chance; and on the other hand, it is hardly likely to be the result of borrowing from Shakspere by another author, or vice versa, since the words spoken are in no way memorable. Rather, the probable explanation is that Shakspere, writing of two similar circumstances in plays not far separated in time, naturally fell into the same pattern of language for both.[3]

The parallel just cited is buttressed by another between line 1 of the *Timon* scene and *Cymbeline* IV, 1, 27-28. When Cloten is seeking Imogen and Posthumus in the woods near the cave of Belarius, he says, in the course of a soliloquy: "This is the very description of their meeting-place; . . ." Again the woods and the situations are much the same.

Other Shaksperian parallels that carry weight are those to line 9 of the *Timon* scene, specifically to the use of the verb "set down" in the sense of getting into position for a siege. In this intransitive form the expression occurs at least five times in Shakspere:

Sen. Let us alone to guard Corioli:
If they set down before's, for the remove
Bring up your army. (*Coriolanus* 1, 2, 27-29).

Val. . . . your lord and Titus Lartius are set down before their city Corioli . . . (*Coriolanus* 1, 3, 109-10).

Hel. . . . our virginity, though valiant, in the defence yet is weak; unfold to us some warlike resistance.

Par. There is none: man setting down before you will undermine you and blow you up. (*All's Well* I, 1, 127-31).

Ant. Caesar sets down in Alexandria, where I will oppose his fate. (*Ant. & Cl.* III, 13, 168-69).

Siw. We learn no other but the confident tyrant
Keeps still in Dunsinane, and will endure
Our setting down before't. (*Macb.* V, 4, 8-10).

Shakspere also employs the verb transitively in *Coriolanus*, V, 3, 1-2:

We will before the walls of Rome tomorrow
Set down our host.

The *N.E.D.* describes both uses of the word as obsolete and

takes three of its six illustrations from among the six listed above. None of the other three is taken from any Elizabethan dramatist. In Crawford's concordances to Kyd and Marlowe, moreover, there is no record of employment of the word under discussion. I can also state with considerable assurance that it does not occur in any of the dramas of Lyly, Peele, or Greene, and I may add that, although I have kept watch for it in my reading during several years past, I have not met with it at all in the contemporary Elizabethan drama. This word, then, seems to be a decidedly uncommon one with the playwrights of the period.

More particularly, Middleton, the dramatist most commonly mentioned as author of the *Timon* scene, does not use either 'set down' or 'sit down' in this military sense, so far as I am able to ascertain. During a careful reading of most of Middleton's plays [5] I have not found a single example. Nor does Chapman make use of either in the five of his best-known plays [6] which I have been able to examine. By contrast, Shakspere's six adoptions of the infrequently used word 'set down' are conspicuous.

The remaining Shaksperian parallels to the *Timon* scene are not individually strong but I cite them as cumulative evidence. To line 3:

Cel. Some, how brief the life of man
Runs his erring pilgrimage,
That the stretching of a span
Buckles in his sum of age:
(*As You Like It,* III, 2, 137-40).

Iago. A soldier's a man;
A life's but a span. (*Othello,* II, 3, 73-74).

The misanthropic idea that men are beasts, expressed in line 4, is current during the period, but we should at least note that Shakspere frequently utters it:

Since men prove beasts, let beasts bear gentle minds
(*Lucrece,* 1148).

Duke S. I think he be transform'd into a beast,
For I can nowhere find him like a man.
(*As You Like It* II, 7, 1-2).

K. Rich. A king of beasts, indeed; if aught but beasts,
I had been still a happy king of men. (*Rich.* 2, V, 1, 35-36).

Similarly, line 8 of the *Timon* scene has numberless general analogues in Shakspere, as in other Elizabethan writers[7]. I quote two:

> Young in limbs, in judgment old (*Merchant, II,* 7, 71).
> His years but young, but his experience old,
> His head unmellow'd, but his judgment ripe:
> (*Two Gentlemen,* II, 4, 69-70).

The parallels given above even when taken all together are, of course, far from establishing Shakspere's authorship of *Timon,* Act V, Scene 3, but they have an evidential value which may well justify a reopening of the question.

University of Washington
Seattle, Wash.

---

[1]Among those who deny Shakspere's authorship are H. N. Hudson (ed. *Works,* 1851, V. 10), Wm. G. Clark & Wm. Aldis Wright (ed. *Works,* 1865, VII, 315), F. G. Fleay ("Shakespeare's Share in *Timon of Athens*", *Trans. New Shak. Soc'y,* 1874, pp. 130-195), C. H. Herford (ed. *Works,* 1902, X, 150), K. Deighton (ed. *Timon of Athens,* 1905, p. 143), I. Gollancz (ed. *Works,* 1907, IX, Preface), E. H. Wright (*The Authorship of Timon of Athens,* 1910, pp. 54-6). J. M. Robertson (*Shakespeare and Chapman,* 1917, p. 140), H. D. Sykes ("The problem of *Timon of Athens*", *N. & Q.,* Aug. 11 & Sept. 15, 1923), and T. M. Parrott (*The Problem of Timon of Athens,* 1923, p. 19). But see, *contra,* E. K. Chambers (*William Shakespeare,* 1930, I, 480-84) and Wm. Wells (*N. & Q.,* June 5, 1920, pp. 266-9).

[2]Quotations and line numberings hereafter are from the Globe edition.

[3]I must point out the existence of what might be called a semi-parallel in Middleton's *Blurt, Master-Constable,* I, 2, 40-50: "What, ho! Nobody speaks? Where dwells the constable?" These lines, however, do not destroy the force of the Shaksperian parallel quoted above. The strength of the latter resides in the identity of situation and the recurrence of *all* of the Timon words in *Cymbeline.* In Middleton the situation is quite different and only one or two of the Timon words appear.

[4]In this quotation and in the next I am following the reading of the First Folio, which has "setting down" and "sets down" respectively. Some editors, including the Globe editors, change to "sitting down" and "sits down", without apparent justification. Other editors, among whom are Brigstocke for *All's Well* (Arden) and Furness for *Antony and Cleopatra* (Variorum), properly retain the Folio version. "Sit down," meaning to encamp with an army, appears in the Folio only in *Coriolanus* (IV, 7, 28). As the *N.E.D.* shows, the two words were virtually synonymous in meaning but distinct in form.

[5]I have checked the following eighteen plays in Bullen's edition: *The Old Law, Michaelmas Term, Mayor of Queenborough, A Trick to Catch the Old One, Roaring Girl, The Phoenix, Blurt, Master-Constable, A Fair Quarrel, The Widow, No Wit, no Help like a Woman's, A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, Anything for a Quiet Life, The Witch, The Changeling, The Spanish Gypsy, Women Beware Women, More Dissemblers Besides Women, A Game at Chess.*

[6]*Conspiracy of Byron, Tragedy of Byron, Bussy D'Ambois, Revenge of Bussy, All Fools.*

[7]*Cf.* Middleton's "A prince elder in virtues than in years" and "His judgment is a father to his youth" (*Phoenix,* I, 1, 17-18).

WHEN ELIZABETHANS LAUGHED

By WM. VAN O'CONNOR

SHAKSPERE learned early in his career that Comedy and Tragedy are akin, that Comedy is man's relief valve against Tragedy. Hysteria and laughter differed only in the degree of their intensity; thus Hamlet called to the ghost of his father,

> Ah, ha, boy! say'st thou so, art thou there, truepenny?—
> Come on,—you hear this fellow in the cellarage—
> Consent to swear.

The cry could not have been incongruous to Hamlet. Shakspere meant that Hamlet, like other men, was prone to terror while in contact with the nether world, that Hamlet chose to laugh at his fear to save himself the tense nervous reaction that follows fright. There seems little else to be said in regard to this scene, despite the many theories it has given rise to.

Shakspere knew that the fright caused by Tragedy is not lasting, and that its passing leaves us neither with a sense of exultation nor in a mood of peace and quiet. Man accepted it stoically since it was a part of Life's core, essential in the Scheme. Perhaps man once feared Tragedy greatly, as primitive man fears thunder, but aeons of watching it strike had erased the terror in some degree. It was true that moments of intense excitement were experienced when Tragedy was stretching forth her hand, the *moments* that vitalized drama; but we settled back after the blow and asked with a semi-defiant smile, "Well, is that all?" The fear was transient. If Shakspere did not know this before going up to London, he knew it by 1595. He was hurt and bewildered when his love for the "dark lady" went unrequited, and especially when she dropped him completely for a new love. He then addressed his "Poor soul, the center of my sinful earth:"

> And let that pine to aggravate thy store;
> Buy terms divine in selling hours of dross;
> Within be fed, without be rich no more:

> So shalt thou feed on Death, that feeds on man,
> And, Death, once dead, there's no more dying then. (Son. 146.)

Shakspere soon was aware that men had an important weapon to be used against Tragedy: the weapon of retreat into laughter. In using this weapon Shakspere's pessimism rose out of darkness into a refulgent light; man *could* combat Tragedy.

Tragedy had two agents: chance and society. The second was the more awful, for it was man's weakness betraying man. The Greeks, he knew from his school days, had employed the former type in their drama. The gods singled out those who would die out of their beds, with blood spurting from their chests, those who would die horribly, victims of the gods, victims of chance. Chance could be defied only with courageous, though ineffective laughter. Society, however, was man's own doing. Society grew more and more intricate, rules and laws piled up endlessly, and man eventually became entangled in the spidery web of his own making. Take the tragic end of Falstaff, and his end *was* tragic. Falstaff knew how to slip out of the harness of laws, in retreat he was marvelous. His weakness lay in knowing nothing of truce making, in knowing nothing of compromise. The Tragedy that arose out of society could be coped with by judiciously using humor and by compromise.

The humor found in ridicule and satire Shakspere left mostly to Jonson and Marston. He was not averse to using a gentle satire, as he did in *Love's Labour's Lost,* pointing out that men should not oppose the natural order of mating. But he felt, it seems, that satire, like destructive criticism, is of small efficacy in changing man. Jonson felt that the humor in Shakspere's soul flowed forth too freely: "His wit was in his own power; would that the rule of it had been so too! Many times he fell into those things; could not escape laughter, as when he said in the person of Caesar, one speaking to him, 'Caesar, thou dost me wrong.' He replied, 'Caesar did never wrong but with just cause,' and

such like, which were ridiculous."[1] Each man had a different concept of the essence of humor.

Jonson believed that humor caused by the recognition of things we have long known or conceived of as possible was the essential part of humor. There is ample evidence in his plays that this was his belief. The attraction of a pretty blonde head in our society would be ridiculed by a modern Jonson, and probably with some bitterness. Shakspere had little time for such pettiness. He concentrated on the laughter of escape from reality. In our day escapist theories run through hundreds of volumes, and we talk of it as though it were a recent discovery.

Some scholars (Dover Wilson among them) have said that though the miracle plays of our forefathers contained coarse humor, we look to the morality plays to find comedy that is distinct from buffoonery. In the morality plays characteristics of man are personified, and put on the stage. Foibles afford a ready abstraction; one's proclivities toward foppishness, for example, as in Sir Foppling Flutter. On the whole these characters are quite unsatisfactory. Yet in the midst of the morality play characters we find Everyman, one with a distinctive personality. He has the chameleon moods of a Cleopatra; more than an abstraction, he is shrewd, he has strength and weakness. His human, many-faceted personality has a strong appeal for us. He is not a puppet moved by the dramatist; his personality moves the theme. Falstaff, too, was more than an abstraction.

Falstaff spent his life running away from reality, matching his wits against society. Hal, with the strict background of the court ever hanging over him, his rule guided life as king ahead of him, appreciated Falstaff's ability and genius for thumbing his nose at the world, and the ease with which he escaped the effects of breaking imposed laws. When we follow Falstaff on the stage, however, we are not following an abstraction of man's desire to thumb his nose at the world, we are following a human being who is attempting it. We are ever conscious that eventually he must come to grips with society, and that unless the gods inter-

vene he will be beaten. Like Everyman, he has to choose his way of life. His glib, facile tongue will carry him how far? Hal compromises, then gives in to society, settles into the mould made for him. We lose sympathy with Hal, and continue our pursuit of Falstaff into the values of unreality. We enjoy his strange "reasoning," word tossing, wondering how long he can sustain it. We enjoy it the more because he is using formal "logic," making gloriously fustian speeches, using the very tool that society was wielding against him, and—bless him! ignoring the cold spirit of it. Jonson would, and perhaps did, call Falstaff's "reasoning" ridiculous. It was, but we will always laugh when the seams of reality are turned inside out.

Shakspere, in part, was Falstaff. He was tired of the rules that bound his life. E. A. Robinson had Ben compromise his opinion of Shakspere, as we know it, and say:

> I tell him he needs Greek;
> I'll talk of rules and Aristotle with him,
> And if his tongue's at home he'll say to that,
> "I have your word that Aristotle knows,
> And you mine that I don't know Aristotle."
> He's at odds with all the unities,
> And what's yet worse, it doesn't seem to matter;
> He treads along through Time's old wilderness
> As if the tramp of all the centuries
> Had left no roads—and there are none, for him;
> He doesn't see them, even with those eyes—
> And that's the pity, or I say it is.

Falstaff too, had refused to walk old roads in the hot sun, though in the long run the old roads would have been the easiest. Did this conflict in Shakspere, the pull between the dreamer and the man of action, reach its burning culmination in *Hamlet?*

Shakspere knew that society must inevitably win. Thus he chose to own a house in Stratford, and to boast a coat-of-arms. We watch Falstaff lose. He dies broken-hearted and despised. Hal left him, and their common world of let's-pretend to take up the business of a king. Ben Jonson disliked the same society, but he chose to fight against it,

and not to escape it. Angry and puzzled, despite his arbitrary manner, Ben took his pen and bitterly exposed the weaknesses of his fellows, often going to excess. When the satire was not carried too far, the audience laughed with him, and at themselves, but they remained unchanged. Shakspere saw the same London, looked back at the world and saw that satire had usually failed. He appealed to his audience in another way, by leading them into the Mind's Wonderland; and in doing so he reached their hearts. Carlyle saw that Shakspere was the true voice of the inarticulate English heart: "And yet they did produce one Shakspere: consider how the element of Shaksperian melody doth lie imprisoned in their nature; reduced to unfold itself in mere cotton mills, Constitutional Governments, and such like—all the more interesting when it does become visible, as even in such unexpected shapes it succeeds in doing."[2] The gentler observer seems to have understood his audience well. He helped them escape from their London, and with him they laughed gloriously, with the laughter of the free.

Columbia University, New York

---

[1]Timber, Or Discoveries, i "De Shakspere nostra"
[2]*Past and Present*, "The English."

"THE FOURTH FORGER": A SUPPLEMENTAL MINORITY REPORT

By WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

ON John Mair's lively account of the Ireland forgeries[1] I have made an adverse report in rather general terms,[2] and would be content to let the matter rest. The highly complimentary notices in the London *Times,* the New York *Times,* and the New York *Herald-Tribune*[3] suggest, however, that the book's defects are not immediately obvious and that it will be helpful to the student to specify some of them. I shall note briefly certain obvious errors and omissions. The absence of all scholarly *apparatus* makes it impossible to tell whether or not Mair's disagreements with previous writers as to facts are based on new evidence; and some of these disagreements I shall also record.

1. "The Fourth Forger." In the Rev. William Mason's scurrilous verses this phrase was applied to Samuel Ireland, not to William Henry, the subject of this book.

2. " . . . except a brief, superficial . . . essay . . . no detailed account . . . has ever been written" (p. xiii). It was hardly necessary to allude to this honors thesis by a Harvard undergraduate;[4] but the essays by Richard Grant White[5] and Philip W. Sergeant[6] should have been mentioned. Mair seems to have used both; see below.

3. "Samuel Ireland began life obscurely," etc. (p. 1). This material is drawn, not very exactly, from *DNB.* More and more exact details are given by G. H. Libbis,[7] who had MS journals of Samuel Ireland and his uncle.

4. "In 1789" (p. 3). *DNB* says 1790.

5. "In 1787 . . . Walpole . . . *had produced* . . ." (p. 3). *DNB* says "was preparing."

6. "His wife had died [vague as to date] . . . looked after by his housekeeper, Mrs. Freeman . . . Mrs. Ireland [wrote] a rhyming attack on Dr. Cadogan" (p. 5). Libbis[8] describes Mrs. Freeman as Ireland's mistress, the children as hers, and makes her the author of the attack on Cadogan. A passage in the *Farington Diary,*[9] confirms this view of her

position, as against Mair's vague statement that there is no evidence of William's illegitimacy (p. 7).

7. "About this time . . . remained for four years on the Continent" (p. 9). He left England in May, 1789, and returned in 1792. Mair is following Ireland's *Confessions* (1805) in saying "four years"; in the *Authentic Account* (1796) Ireland gives three years as the period of his life abroad.

8. "In the spring of 1793 . . ." (p. 13). The date of the famous trip to Stratford is elsewhere given as 1794: "in 1794";[10] "about 1794 . . . Returning to London in the autumn of 1794";[11] "October 1794."[12]

9. The conversation about the burned papers (pp. 18-19) is copied, not accurately, from the *Confessions.* The earlier version, in the *Authentic Account,* is probably more "authentic." In any case Williams's wife, described by Ireland as "a very respectable elderly lady," need not have been accused of eavesdropping.

Mair says on p. 18 that Williams owned Clopton House (the word in the *Confessions* is "occupied"); but on p. 19 he refers to Mr. Wyatt as Williams's landlord.

10. "Dr. Warton said" (p. 35). This does not follow in phrasing any one of the three versions reported by the Irelands. Mair does not enumerate the amusing and inconsistent disclaimers of Warton and Parr.

11. "Blackfriar's property which the poet bought in 1612" (p. 52). Mr. Mair has been trapped by an "old style" date. The deed was executed on March 10, 1613.[13]

12. "Shakespeare's Library" (p. 54). More exact information was available to Mr. Mair, in the researches of Dr. Tannenbaum.[14]

13. In the chapter "Public Opinion" (pp. 56-68), few dates are given and the details are set down in anything but a chronological order. The result is therefore confusing.

14. "There had even been Shakespearian fabrications earlier in the century . . . Theobald's *Edward III,* and aptly entitled *Double Falsehood,* or Rowe's *Jane Shore,* which, though their claims were never taken very seriously, had caused a good deal of discussion at the time" (p. 73).

It is hardly necessary to remark that "Theobald's *Edward III*" does not exist and that *Jane Shore* was an avowed

imitation, not a forgery. The status of *Double Falsehood* is not yet determined, but there is some ground for the belief that it is a revision of an Elizabethan play; and Mr. Mair should know this.

15. The general line of reasoning in Chapter Six seems to have been suggested by Richard Grant White's essay, to which no reference is made.

16. "A bad actor and a worse writer, Waldron had ambitions . . ." (p. 146). Mair has here appropriated, somewhat inexactly, and used in an obscure way an angry phrase from Samuel Ireland's *Vindication* (p. 45): "One Waldron likewise [in addition to Malone] has waded into the controversy, a bad actor and a worse critic." (Waldron was prompter at the Haymarket Theatre and collected books on Shakspere.)

17. ". . . the five hundred copies [of Malone's *Inquiry*] sold in the two days before the production of *Vortigern* must have carried more weight . . ." (p. 172).

Sergeant (p. 265), discussing the question of precedence as between the production of *Vortigern* and Malone's attack, concludes that though review copies of the pamphlet had been issued, it is doubtful if "any copies were in the hands of the public until after the performance."

18. Mair's conjecture (p. 195) that Albany Wallis connived in Ireland's forgeries was put forth in 1925 in much the same form, by Sergeant (p. 273).

19. "On June 4th [1796] . . . he was married . . ." (p. 208). June 6 is the date given by *DNB* and by Sergeant (p. 278). Libbis[15] says the marriage was on July 4, "and not on June 6."

20. "Seen on Sundays in Kensington Gardens" (p. 208) Mrs. Freeman heard from Miss Earle that she had seen "Sam" [W.H.I.] in Kensington Gardens on one particular Sunday, June 26.[16]

21. The indication of dates in Chapter Fifteen is vague and somewhat inexact.[17] In substance the chapter follows Sergeant closely, even paragraph by paragraph at times. Mair's chapter ends (p. 222): "'He said impudently: "those are *bold* and *hard* words for any man to *dare* to say!" on which I observed I was not accustomed to such language and withdrew downstairs.' Mr. Ireland and his son never met again."

Sergeant had paraphrased Samuel's letter, which Mair quotes; but notice his conclusion (p. 283): "Indignantly Samuel said that he was not accustomed to such language, and hurried away downstairs. As far as we know, father and son never met again."

22. "In December he wrote . . ." (p. 224). Sergeant says the date was Nov. 1; *DNB* says "in November."

23. "In July 1800 Samuel died" (p. 226). Libbis says the date was June 14.[18]

24. "He died in Suffolk Place, London" (p. 230). *DNB*, Sergeant, and Libbis all give "Sussex Place, St. Giles in the Fields."

---

[7]Quoted in Francis Hackett: *Henry the Eighth,* 136—. Vives' equally famous letter *Of Human Need,* or *The Relief of the Poor,* to the Senate of Bruges, 1526, is also opposite, especially to the next following quotation from *K.L.* in the text above, "shake the superflux to them." In part, it reads: "certain surplus funds have been distributed by the state" (ch. 1). "Let the wealthy hospitals share their superfluous funds with the poorer. But if the poorer hospitals are not in need of help, then let the surplus be given to those who suffer in secret" . . . "Then in regard to the beggars who wander about with no fixed dwelling places . . . even those who have dissipated their fortunes in riotous living, by gambling, harlots, extravagance, and gluttony, must be relieved" (final chapter): *Studies in Social Work, New York School of Philanthropy.*

[8]"Those watching-Dogs, which in their sleep we sometimes see to grumble, and then barking to startle suddainly out of their slumber, as if they perceived some stranger to arrive: that stranger which their mind seemeth to see, is but an imaginarie man, and not perceived; without any dimension, colour, or being" (179). Shakspere needed merely to invert this to get the stranger out of it, whose (deranged) mind saw but "imaginarie dogs."

[1]*The Fourth Forger: William Ireland and the Shakespeare Papers;* London, 1938; New York, 1939.

[2]*Saturday Review of Lit.,* June 24, 1939.

[3]*T.L.S.,* Aug. 6, 1938; N. Y. Times *Book Review,* June 4, 1939; Herald-Tribune *Books,* July 2, 1939.

[4]Derk Bodde: *Shakspere and the Ireland Forgeries,* 1930.

[5]Introduction to the American edition (1874) of Ireland's *Confessions.*

[6]"Young Ireland," in *Liars and Fakers* [1925], pp. 237-83, 306-08.

[7]*NQ,* 160: 201 ff.

[8]*Loc. cit.*

[9]I. 133.

[10]Chambers: *William Shakespeare,* II. 297.

[11]*DNB.*

[12]Sergeant, 246.

[13]Chambers: *William Shakespeare,* II. 154.

[14]*Problems in Shakspere's Penmanship,* 160.

[15]*NQ,* 160:221.

[16]Sergeant, 277.

[17]*E.g.* Mair writes: "In the same month [December, 1796] appeared *Mr. Ireland's Vindication . . .*" (p. 218). But according to *DNB* it appeared in November.

[18]*NQ,* 160:220.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

MISTRESS OPHELIA

An anonymous writer in *Notes and Queries* wishes to know on what grounds some persons think that Ophelia had been Hamlet's mistress. He seems to be unaware of the fact, or is too delicate to mention it, that according to some of these diviners of Shakspere's true intentions in this play Ophelia, trusting Ophelia, the helpless one, had even given birth to a child of Hamlet's begetting, and that this unlooked-for circumstance drove her to suicide by drowning. What *are* the bases for these theories?

In the first place, Laertes, at the beginning of the play, cautions his simple-minded sister to beware of the trifling of Hamlet's favor. The Paris-bred gentleman knows that a wooer's "songs," combined with the influence of moonlight walks (and the moon does shine in Denmark), may cause the chariest maid to "open her chaste treasure to his unmaster'd importunity." Her father, too, an experienced man of the world, realizing the perilousness of the situation, cautions her that her—and his—honor are in danger. Clearly, say the up-to-date interpreters of *Hamlet,* Shakspere would not have dwelt at such length upon a matter which was to play no part in the subsequent conduct of the play. Hamlet is a man; Ophelia is a woman; both are young, sentimental, romantic—and spend much time in each other's company.

All this may be granted; men and women in real life undoubtedly often act this way, but *Hamlet* is not a portrait of real life,—it is a romantic tragedy stemming from the Renaissance. The "gentleman" of that day did not seduce his feminine idol. Hamlet is the model Renaissance gentleman; he is "the glass of fashion and the mold of form" (*i.e.,* the pattern of what is proper). That the doddering, dishonorable Polonius and his more dishonorable and profligate son think Hamlet capable of betraying the simple-minded Ophelia is one of the tragic elements in this play. They speak for themselves, not for Shakspere. Their foolish and wicked judgements are only a display of their base natures. But, for all that, it is certain that Laertes did not think his sister had been seduced by the maligned Prince. At her funeral he speaks of violets springing from her "unpolluted flesh."

Hamlet, engaged in conversation with Polonius, warns the foolishly cunning old man to keep his daughter out of the sun lest she may "conceive" in a way that will not prove to his liking. This is supposed to be Hamlet's confession that his relations with Ophelia had passed the bounds of propriety. Had this been so, we would have to think of Hamlet as a cad of the most contemptible breed,—obviously not the kind of man the artistic world of more than three centuries has found in Hamlet. Hitherto these speeches of his have been interpreted as indications that he is playing a role, confirming in Polonius the notion that he is insane, and that he suspects or knows why Polonius has ordered Ophelia to return his love-tokens and deny him access to her.

A further argument, an unanswerable one (say some), is to be found in the smutty songs with which Ophelia entertains the royal couple in her "mad scene," especially the very naughty one about what happened on Saint Valentine's day, and, even more

especially, the one about what young men will do "if they come to 't." It is said that the great German poet and novelist, Goethe, was convinced by these songs that Ophelia had been a sort of younger sister of Marguerite. Neither he nor his successors seem to have known that the chatter and ravings of the insane are always heavily larded with the obscene and the pornographic. Ah, but where and wherefore did she learn these wicked lyrics? For the answer to this profound problem we refer the reader to Mr. Dover Wilson, the discoverer of the momentous and significant fact that when Hamlet urges Ophelia to go to a "nunnery" he wants her to understand that he is using the word as a synonym for a 'house of prostitution."

Much, too, is made of the fact that in *The Hystorie of Hamblet,* Shakspere's alleged source, Ophelia's counterpart in the plot to discover Hamblet's true state is a "faire and beautifull woman" of easy virtue who is willing to "allure his mind to have his pleasure of her." Of course, Shakspere might have been sufficiently resourceful to depart from his original, or he might have remembered, though the "scholars" do not, that in the aforesaid original the prince "was informed of the treason" by the lady, because she was "one that from her infancy loved and favoured him, and would have been exceeding sorrowful for his misfortune." The new school of Shakspere critics, being neither critics nor scholars, read only what suits their purposes.

Then there is the damned fact of the disrespectful and obscene comments addressed by Hamlet to Ophelia as he prepares to lie in her lap and watch how his uncle-father takes *The Murder of Gonzago.* The conversation *is* indelicate, even by Broadway standards. But it does not prove any guilty relations between the prince and the lady. Hamlet is obviously insulting. Had she not that very day, only a few hours ago, deliberately played the rôle of a decoy to betray him to his enemies? Ophelia, not conscious of any purposed evil, finds herself in a painful situation in which she has to humor a confirmed madman.

Some of the unthinking are greatly impressed by the fact that the Priest, attempting to pacify the outraged Laertes, points out that though his sister's death was (from a juridico-religious viewpoint) "doubtful," "she is allowed her virgin crants." The use of the word "virgin" is supposed to settle the matter. But it does not really do so. The Priest has said nothing to imply that there was any question about Ophelia's virginity; the question disturbing him was whether the accidental death of an insane person is a voluntary act which bars the deceased from certain religious rites. What he says about her "virgin crants" means only that Ophelia is being accorded all the "rites" (the Folio's substitute for "crants") customary at the burial of an unmarried girl.

The gossipy gravediggers, not understanding the significance of the Crowner's verdict, prate as if there had been some question whether Ophelia's death by drowning had been accidental or voluntary. From this the defamers of Hamlet and Ophelia would infer that Ophelia had committed suicide because she thought she was with child! Strange that Dr. Johnson, Malone, Coleridge, Dowden, Bradley, and thousands of other readers and students of Hamlet never found the remotest hint of this motive in the play. The Queen's description of the mad Ophelia's death as the result of the breaking of an "envious sliver" certainly settles the matter to all common sense. No doubt the defenders of the

absurd notion we are discussing will say that the Queen was lying and will give some esoteric reason for her prevarication. But we cannot pursue this trend of thought,—that way madness lies.

A VALUABLE BOOK

The Yale University Press has just brought out a book which university librarians and Shaksperian scholars will welcome with pleasure. It is a second and revised edition of the well-known Pollard-Bartlett *Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto* (1594-1709) which was originally published in 1916 in a handsome quarto for $7.50.

Revision of this important bibliographic book has become necessary because of the considerable new material which has come to light since the original publication, because of certain changes in current views regarding some of Shakspere's plays, because of the migrations of certain quartos since 1916, and so forth. The revision is the work solely of Miss Henrietta C. Bartlett, and is a genuine revision, not merely a reprint or a re-issue. It is worthy of particular mention that the original introduction of some thirty-odd pages has been wholly omitted, for reasons which we can but guess. The book is 10½" x 7½", handsomely printed, cloth bound, gold lettered, thoroughly indexed, and is priced at $10. The edition is limited to 500 copies. We congratulate Miss Bartlett and the Yale University Press on a thoroughly good job.

ENGLAND'S ELIZA

Harvard University Press has just brought out an important and much needed study, amounting almost to an anthology, of the praises which poets and prose writers of her day so lavishly showered upon Queen Eliza.* The author of the work has arranged his material under the following suggestive and practical headings: Judith and the Broadsides, Deborah in Progress, Eliza in the Drama, Fayre Elisa, Diana. Laura or Idea, Cynthia, Gloriana and Belphoebe. One of the most valuable features of this work is a short-title list of books and manuscripts dedicated, inscribed or presented to the Queen. That this torrent of praise was not wholly deserved by Elizabeth may safely be taken for granted, but, after all, poets, dramatists, balladists and prose scribblers must eat. It is one of Shakspere's great claims to our respect that, apart from a purely casual reference to the Queen in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* he cannot be shown ever to have stooped to lavishing praises on a woman who was probably no better and no more idealistic than she needed to be. But that, of course, was none of Dr. Wilson's concern. That he did his best to make out a case for Shakspere as one of Elizabeth's flatterers goes almost without saying. We have no sympathy whatsoever with his attempt to show that in his delineation of Henry V and in his other historical plays, Shakspere had the popular Elizabeth in mind. But Dr. Wilson has unquestionably done a good piece of work in his analysis of the eulogia showered upon their Queen by so many of her contemporaries.

* *England's Eliza*, by Dr. Elkin C. Wilson, pp. xii + 479, 15 illustrations, cloth bound, $5.00.

TEACHING LITERATURE

(A broadcast over WBNX on Nov. 19th)

In no part of the United States is a High School curriculum or a College curriculum considered complete without several courses in English literature. The teaching of "literature" costs this country many millions of dollars per year. Considering what benefits readers are supposed to derive from literature, this is as it should be. Teachers, critics, and esthetics seem to be agreed that no subject at

school is of more lasting or greater value to a student than the cultivation of a taste and a hunger for good literature. Good literature is capable of teaching the reader much about all sorts of things, times, places and peoples which he would not otherwise be likely to learn; it sharpens the readers' wits; it adds to his vocabulary and stock of ideas; it widens his mental perspective; it enlarges his sympathies; it teaches him to understand himself and his fellows; and it admits him to membership in a circle where he can meet some of the best minds and spirits not only of his own time but of past ages. A great English critic, philosopher and poet, Samuel Coleridge, commenting on his own addiction to poetry, said: "It has soothed my afflictions, multiplied and refined my enjoyments, has endeared solitude, has given me the habit of wishing to discover the good and the beautiful in all that surrounds me." What he said of poetry applies, of course, to all good literature. It is apparent that good creative literature has its value not only for the mind, the intellect, but also for the heart, the emotions, the feelings, and the sentiments. Clearly, anything that is capable of doing all this is of the highest value and deserves the most careful and serious consideration in our schools and colleges. For here is something of permanent value to our students.

Unfortunately, the formation of the habit of reading and the cultivation of a taste for good literature are not likely to result from the literature courses which students now are required to take. Most, if not almost all, teachers find it easier to assign lessons in some manual of English literature which teaches the facts about the "lives" of the authors of our literture. This is teaching literary history, not literature. The work in the classroom consists of lectures and quizzes on these meagre and desultory facts,—facts which, *per se,* are of very little value, which are forgotten almost as soon as they have been learned, or after the examination is over, facts which anyone can find for himself in any one of hundreds of reference works should he need them.

The classroom teaching of the literary masterpieces usually becomes a quiz on grammatical peculiarities, on the etymology of certain words, or the paraphrase of condensed locutions. The almost invariable result is a thorough loathing for the great masterpieces. Repeatedly have graduate students confided to me that as a result of their college experiences they considered Shakspere a bore and doubted the sincerity of those who went into raptures about him. Chaucer and Milton are practically never read by our university graduates. The story is told of a boy who came home from school one day and said to his father excitedly: "Dad, please read me *Julius Caesar* today." "What's the hurry, son?" asks Dad. "We're going to take it up in school tomorrow, and I want to enjoy it once more before I get to hate it." It does a student not a particle of good to have heard lectures about *Hamlet* and its problems if he have not fallen under the spell of its magical poetry. The futility of present methods of teaching Shakspere may be gathered from the fact that one very rarely meets a college graduate or teacher who can say what Shakspere meant with the words "The quality of mercy is not strain'd" or "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

How, then, is literature to be taught? My answer is that every lesson in the literature class should be made an artistic experience. The teacher should interpret the work for his students in such a way as to appeal to their hearts and their imaginations. Historical, etymological and grammatical facts

should be treated as something wholly secondary and incidental, not as primary. The purely intellectual faculties, memory and logic may be left to be developed in the scientific courses. Of course, classroom interpretations should be accompanied with necessary comments and explanations. If literature were taught this way it would tend to breed in the students a keener sympathy for the sufferings of their less fortunate fellows, a better understanding of their neighbors (near and far), greater tolerance for differences of opinion and modes of thought, and a readier disposition to cooperate with the rest of mankind in making life more tolerable and humane. Lesser benefits would be the revival of the lost art of reading aloud and an improvement in our speaking voices.

Such a radical change in teaching literature necessarily implies a different training for our teachers, a training in good reading and in the art of interpretation. Those who know the mentality and capacities of our teachers know that such training is not impossible.

COMMUNICATION

TWO SHAKSPERE PARALLELS IN STUDLEY'S TRANSLATION OF SENECA'S *AGAMEMNON*

"W. R's." prefatory verses to Studley's translation of Seneca's *Agamemnon* contain these lines:

Fore woordes auayleth not a rushe
And good wine neads no tauerne bushe.

which will recall the proverb, "Good wine needs no bush," in the Epilog to *As You Like It.* Another Shakspere parallel occurs in the chorus at the end of the first act of the *Agamemnon,* where we read:

One clod of croked care another bryngeth in,
One hurlye, buryle done, another doth begin:

It suggests, of course, "When the hurlyburly's done" in *Macbeth.* A search among publications devoted to Elizabethan proverbs and to the influence of Seneca discloses no reference to either of these passages; editions of Shakspere, from the Malone *Variorum* to the Cambridge and Arden editions, provide extensive notes on *bush* and *hurlyburly,* but ignore "W. R." and Studley, as do the *NED* and the *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs.*

Shakspere's use of the proverb concerning wine cannot be attributed to borrowing from "W. R." The proverb was common throughout Europe, and no printed source is necessary to explain its presence in *As You Like It,* especially one so obscure as the octavo *Agamemnon* of 1566, in which edition only "W. R.'s" use of the proverb should be of interest to those investigating Elizabethan proverbs.

The other passage has more significance, for a distinct parallelism exists between Studley's line and Shakspere's, both verbal and in the situations that call them forth. The chorus in which Studley's line appears is filled with reflections on the fickle fate of kings, and these reflections are accompanied by a description of a storm. The conquering Agamemnon is about to arrive home, and his murder by his wife and her lover is foreshadowed. It might be noted also that the weird sisters in *Macbeth* serve as a sort of chorus. In addition, the passage can be added to those that provide cumulative evidence that Shakspere was indebted to the *Tenne Tragedies* of 1581 rather than to the Latin (if to either), for Shakspere's line can hardly be derived from the original, which reads:

Alia ex alia cura fatigat,
Vexatque animos nova tempestas.

CORNELL M. DOWLIN.

University of Pennsylvania.

Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints

100 West 31st Street

New York, N. Y.

SERIES II (Ready)

$15.00 the set (*postage extra*)

JOHN CAIUS, *A boke, or counseill against the disease commonly called the sweate, or sweatyng sicknesse.* London: Richard Grafton, 1552. ($2.50)

BAPTISTA SPAGNUOLI (MANTUANUS), *The eglogs turned into English verse by George Turbervile.* London: Henry Bynneman, 1567. ($4.00)

ROBERT GRAY, *A Good Speed to Virginia.* London: Felix Kyngston, 1609.
RICHARD RICH, *Newes from Virginia.* London: E. Alde, 1610. ($2.00)

NATHANIEL WARD, *The Simple Cobler of Aggawam in America.* London: John Dever and Robert Ibbitson, 1647. ($3.00)

NATHANIEL MORTON, *New-Englands Memoriall.* Cambridge (Mass.): S. G. and M. J., 1669. ($4.00)

Each volume bears an Introduction by a prominent authority.

Free to Continuing Subscribers

NOAH WEBSTER, *Sketches of American Policy.* Hartford, 1785.
Edited by Dr. Harry R. Warfel, University of Maryland.

N. B.—25 copies left:

JOHN FLORIO, *Firste Fruites* [London, 1578]. 2 vols. $5.00

2800 items.

BEN JONSON: *A Concise Bibliography*.....$5.00
(Ready in June)
By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

SIR THOMAS ELYOT: *The Castel of Helthe*.....$4.00
A new facsimile of the edition of 1541 and of the Preface of the 1539 edition.
With an introduction by DR. S. A. TANNENBAUM